10 mars 1837

4°

A. gr. a. 608

Morrit

(Homer)

A

VINDICATION OF HOMER

AND OF THE

ANCIENT POETS AND HISTORIANS,

WHO HAVE RECORDED THE

SIEGE AND FALL OF TROY.

IN

ANSWER TO TWO LATE PUBLICATIONS OF Mr. BRYANT.

WITH A MAP AND PLATES.

———FUIT ILIUM, ET INGENS
GLORIA TEUCRORUM.

By J. B. S. MORRITT, Esq.

YORK:

PRINTED BY W. BLANCHARD, FOR T. CADELL, JUN. AND W. DAVIES,
BOOKSELLERS, STRAND, LONDON.
1798.

BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS

A VINDICATION OF HOMER, &c.

Introduction.

IT is a misfortune attending on all old and eſtabliſhed truths, that whilſt they are received in the world as matters of general notoriety, or undoubted authority, we are contented to take them upon truſt, and, not irrationally, give credit to the opinions of thoſe, who had better opportunities than ourſelves to judge of their truth or falſehood. Yet this very circumſtance, by which truth extends the frontiers of her empire, greatly weakens her internal powers of defence, and lulled into ſecurity by the number of her adherents ſhe is too often unprepared to ward off the attacks againſt her perſon at home. In the preſent inſtance, Mr. BRYANT has afforded us a ſtriking proof of this aſſertion. The ſtory of the TROJAN WAR rendered immortal by the greateſt Poet of Antiquity, was received in early Greece as an hiſtorical fact, from thence it has travelled down to us; but it had already been the means of conferring ſo much celebrity upon the pen of HOMER, that whilſt the hiſtorians of all ages recorded the event, the Poets embelliſhed and obſcured a plain tale with every charm of fiction. Relying on this general, if not univerſal aſſent, we add our own tacit acquieſcence to an opinion prevalent through a long ſucceſſion of ages. Sceptics, it is true, have appeared upon this ſubject before Mr. Bryant,

" Sed omnes illacrymabiles
" Urguentur ignotique longâ
" Nocte ——— "

The little effect which their writings have produced on the opinions of mankind, ſhews at leaſt that the facts upon which thoſe opinions were founded could not at that time be overturned. A more ſucceſsful attack is now made upon them, and it is thought by many, that the claims of Antiquity have been legally ſet aſide. Let us attempt, however, generouſly to ſupport her titles, and perhaps if we ſearch candidly for them, their duſty remains will be found, not much impaired, in the neglected archives of time, and common ſenſe. Previous to this however we will examine the arguments by which they have been ſuperſeded; ſince neither authority nor reaſoning can be concluſive, whilſt aſſertions are admitted which impeach the foundations of both. It is neceſſary therefore to refute the charges now too generally admitted againſt her, before we can reſtore to Antiquity her priſtine honours. In my defence of her cauſe, however, declining all advantage ariſing from methodical arrangement, I ſhall take the arguments of Mr. Bryant in the order in which he has placed them, and following him ſtep by ſtep, will reply to his reaſonings as conciſely as poſſible, referring thoſe who chuſe to know more of the controverſy to the peruſal of his extraordinary publication.

HOMER an hiſtorian.*

In the opening of his ſubject Mr. Bryant begins with a due homage to the genius and writings of Homer. He candidly acknowledges many of the circumſtances which have contributed to place him in the rank of an hiſtorian as well as a poet, and allows that the characteriſticks of the Iliad are "ſeldom to be found in romance or fable." He nevertheleſs immediately declares his diſbelief of the whole ſtory, and even of the exiſtence of the far-famed City, the object of the war; which in his opinion was never built in Phrygia.

He

* Mr. BRYANT on the War of Troy, Chap. I. Concerning the excellence of HOMER and his Preciſion.

Homer's Truth or Falſehood, an alternative not indifferent to Mr. Bryant.

He then expreſſes a fear that, though "the alternative" may be quite innocent, his going contrary to the popular opinion may procure him ſome ill-will. Whilſt I diſclaim any ill-will to Mr. Bryant on this account, I cannot help obſerving that, notwithſtanding this appearance of candor, he does not ſeem to me to have conſidered the alternative with indifference. The reader will judge, whether his ſtatements are always perfectly fair, and if he finds that interpretations are given by him to claſſical paſſages wholly unwarranted by the context, tranſlations materially differing from their originals, and erroneous tranſcripts from the originals themſelves, he will be apt to ſmile at the fervour of that zeal which has ſtepped forward, under the maſk of inquiring for literary truth, to defend a favourite Egyptian ſyſtem.

Chronological accuracy not eſſential to the eſtabliſhment of hiſtorical facts.*

The want of preciſion in primitive chronology is the firſt objection brought by Mr. Bryant againſt the veracity of Homer, repeating therefore once more the articles of his diſbelief, he adds, that he adheres firmly to the aſſertion of Varro, that the Greeks had no certain intelligence before the Olympiads. Cenſorinus, however, from whom he quotes, has given the paſſage in the following manner: "M. Varro "primam Olympiadem terminum ponit inter μυθικον tempus, & hiſ- "toricum." But though we aſſign the firſt Olympiad as the æra of accurate chronological hiſtory, ſurely ſome events took place before that time, and may be preſerved by Homer's works, though we cannot date every portion of the hiſtory with the ſame preciſion as we can that of Thucydides. Homer was a poet, and might be an hiſtorian without detailing chronology. But the ſcepticiſm which fixes a doubt upon all hiſtory prior to the Olympiads, and credits all Grecian hiſtory ſubſequent to that time, appears to me to draw a line between hiſtory and fable, with a preciſion which can hardly be ſupported. Homer and Heſiod lived before the Olympiads,

* No hiſtorical certainty previous to the Olympiads. Bryant, p. 9.

Olympiads, if their works were deſtroyed, therefore, we might doubt their exiſtence. Indeed this is the caſe with Orpheus, Linus, Muſæus, and Thamyris, for the forgeries which have appeared under their names, may be, according to this ſyſtem, fabricated on the authority of miſtaken tradition, and not on proofs of their having really exiſted. Where then are we to ſtop? Yet if I ſucceed in ſhewing that the ſtory of Homer contains no anachroniſms, or inconſiſtencies, and that it was ſupported by a deciſive concurrence of internal, traditional, and hiſtorical evidence, the reader will not eaſily acquieſce in the ſcepticiſm required of him. Another paſſage quoted from Juſtin Martyr is adduced, as confirming this aſſertion of Varro.* I am ſorry to

NOTE.

* BRYANT, page 9. Αλλως τε ωδε τυτο υμας αγνοειν προσηκει οτε ωδεν Ἕλλησι προ των ολυμπιαδων ακριβες ισορηται· ωδε εστι συγγραμμα ωαλαιον Ἑλληνων ϗ βαρβαρων σημαινον πραξιν.

"Beſides you ought to be well appriſed that the Grecians have no hiſtory upon which they can "depend antecedent to the Olympiads. They have no written evidence of any Antiquity "relating either to themſelves or other nations."

This comparative argument between the antiquity of the Sacred Writers, and the early hiſtories and fables of Grecians, is a frequent topic with the controverſial Writers of Chriſtianity at this time; but when they aſſert that the æra of Troy was long ſubſequent to the facts recorded by the Jewiſh Lawgiver, they muſt not be underſtood as doubting the exiſtence of the City, to whoſe deſtruction they annex a poſitive date. Theophilus, Biſhop of Antioch, infers from Manetho, that Moſes and the Hebrews were 900 or 1000 years antecedent to the Trojan, or rather Ilian war; προγενέστερον εἶναι τον Μῶσην ϗ τὰς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐννεακοσίους ἢ χιλίους πρὸ τῆ Ιλιακῆ πολέμε. Theophil. Antiochen. ad Autolicum, l. 3, p. 253. Again he declares, "that not only Moſes but the other Prophets preceded all profane writers, and alſo Cronus, Belus, and the Ilian war; for according to the hiſtory of Thallus, Belus is found to have lived only 322 years before the ſiege of Ilium, and we have already found that he conſiders the æra of Moſes as no leſs than 930 years previous to that event." Ibid, p. 382. Lactantius cites this laſt paſſage from Theophilus, and then deriding the temporary Gods of Heathen worſhip, in order to evince the recent date aſſigned to Saturn's birth, who was, however, the father of the reſt, he founds a chronology on the computed ages of ſeveral generations, and adds, "ab excidio autem urbis Trojanæ colliguntur anni 1470," thus making this event the æra from whence hiſtory aſſumed a more regular form; for here the years are no longer computed by genealogical computation. Lactant. l. 1, c. 23. Speaking of Moſes in another place, he ſays, "Trojanum Bellum nongentis fere annis anteceſſit." Ibid. l. 4, c. 5.

to charge both the application and verſion of this ſentence with unfairneſs. Juſtin is aſſerting the higher antiquity of Moſes, and he does not ſay that the Grecians "had no hiſtory on which they could depend," but that they had "none which was accu- "rately detailed," like the records of the Pentateuch; in compariſon with it "they had no writing of antiquity;" but the war of Troy was ſubſequent, and Homer ſtill more ſo.

The grounds of the War adequate.*

Paris, an Aſiatic Prince, came to a Grecian Court, which he inſulted by carrying off the Queen of the Country, and a quantity of treaſure and ſlaves, the property of her huſband. In this plain ſtory there is nothing very incredible. Mr. Bryant, however, collecting together the miraculous ſtories related by different Greek authors, ſees nothing on every ſide but a maſs of impenetrable fiction.* The ſupernatural birth of Helen, the dreams of Hecuba, the education of Paris, † and the conteſt of the three

NOTES.

* Origen in his anſwer to Celſus, in reply to a demand for evidence on a point denied by his adverſary, prefaces his argument by an obſervation ſo much to my purpoſe I cannot help tranſcribing it. "However true a narrative may be," he obſerves, "it is generally difficult, if not impoſſible, to eſtabliſh its truth uncontrovertibly. Suppoſe for inſtance, that the ſtory of the Ilian war is denied, and the denial ſupported by the many impoſſible circumſtances annexed to the hiſtory of that event, how are we to act in ſuch a caſe, where preſſed with fiction interwoven with the univerſally prevalent opinion that the war of Ilium, between the Greeks and Trojans did really and truly take place." Παρὰ πᾶσι δόξη περὶ τοῦ ἀληθῶς γεγονέναι τὸν ἐν Ἰλίῳ πόλεμον Ἑλλήνων καὶ Τρωικῶν. Origen's concluſions from the impoſſible events were very different from Mr. Bryant's, and the war of Troy was by him looked on as an undoubted fact, though a few oſtenſible objections might eaſily be brought againſt it. Origen. contra Celſum, l. i. p. 32. Edit. Spenceri. Cantab. 1658, 4to.

† Paris was appointed the arbitrator between the Goddeſſes on account of his exemplary juſtice, an opinion which Mr. Bryant gives on the authority of Natalis Comes, and then argues on the abſurdity of this aſſertion; but Natalis Comes is ſo modern, that this circumſtance alone anſwers all that can be brought forward on this ſubject; and cannot attach ſuch a charge upon Homer, who partakes very little in the abſurdity of his ſucceſſors. But the antient authors do not ſeem to agree in this opinion of his juſtice, for antecedent to his judgment every claimant for the apple offered him a different bribe, therefore he was at leaſt deemed capable of corruption.

* Obſervations on the grounds of the War. BRYANT, page 10.

Goddeſſes, are in his opinion abſurdities ſo groſs as to impeach the credit of every part of the ſtory. When in ſubſequent times Alexander claimed a heavenly deſcent, and had his claim allowed by the flatterers of his Court, the civilization of the age ſcarce then prevented the miracle from being credited. In the days of Leda, Olympias would have received equal honours, yet we give very implicit credence to the exiſtence of Alexander. Another remark I would make is, that many of the ſtories are reveries of the Poets, or popular legends totally unconnected with Homer. Some of them might convey alluſions which have long ceaſed to be underſtood. The traditions of an infant people are always fabulous, and often allegorical, and the introduction of theſe fictions would with them greatly enhance the merit of a poem, though the foundation of that poem might neverthelefs be a plain hiſtorical fact. Far from palliating or apologiſing for the abſurdity of theſe collateral ſtories, I ſhall boldly aſſert that I do not perceive how any inference can be drawn from them to invalidate facts which partake not of their abſurdity, and that a very ſtrong inference may be drawn on the other ſide, ſince they ſhow that traditions relative to the war of Troy exiſted independent of Homer, and therefore that he was the relater not the inventor of the hiſtory.

Circumſtances of the antecedent armament probable.*

I will now proceed to conſider the conduct of the war and the antecedent armament which took place immediately after the elopement of Helen. Menelaus, the principal ſufferer by this outrage, united himſelf with his Brother, who was a man of power and comparatively extenſive dominion. Greece at this time ſwarmed with warlike adventurers, and whilſt Agriculture was neglected, and Commerce unknown, her bands of warriors

* "On the conduct of the War and antecedent armament." BRYANT, page 12.

led

led by enterprifing chieftains, were ever ready to aſſemble, when the ſtandard of war was erected. Summoned by two of the moſt powerful leaders in Greece, and ſupported by their alliances, a large confederacy was formed at Aulis. It is however leſs to be conſidered as a combination of States than as an aſſembly of warlike adventurers, "Amongſt theſe were Bœotians, Locrians, Mag- " neſians, Ætolians, and Theſprotians of Dodona—the people alſo " of Samos, Rhodes, and Crete, contributed a portion of men and " ſhipping." To this confederacy therefore we find that a number of warriors acceded who were by no means perſonally injured, and who had little or no connexion with Menelaus and Agamemnon.* This with Mr. Bryant is an inſuperable difficulty, but what reaſon have we to to ſuppoſe that they were

BRYANT, page 12.

NOTE.

* A ſtory ſo analogous to that of Troy is given us in Mitford's Hiſtory of Greece, that I cannot help tranſcribing it; its having happened is a proof at leaſt of the poſſibility of a conſiderable force taking arms on ſuch an occaſion, and it is againſt this poſſibility, that Mr. Bryant directs his firſt arguments. " Exploits like that of Paris, were in the twelfth century not uncommon in Ireland. Dermot, King of Leinſter, formed a deſign on Dervorghal, a celebrated beauty, wife of O'Ruark, King of Leitrim, and by force or fraud ſucceeded in carrying her off. O'Ruark reſented the affront as might be expected. He procured a confederacy of the neighbouring chieftains, with the King of Connaught, the moſt powerful Prince in Ireland at their head. Leinſter was invaded, the Princeſs was recovered, and after hoſtilities continued with various ſucceſs, during many years, Dermot was expelled from his kingdom." The fugitive Dermot afterwards intereſted Henry the Second in his quarrel, and the conqueſt of Ireland by the Engliſh, was the reſult of this private animoſity. (See " Mitford's Hiſtory of Greece." Vol. 1. chap. 1. ſect. 4.) How happened it that the King of Connaught and Henry the Second took ſo much intereſt in a quarrel for a woman, " with whom none but the huſband was concerned?" (Bryant, page 17.) " The loſs of a wife (whether Dervorghal or Helen) was a private misfortune in which O'Ruark or Menelaus only were intereſted." We muſt allow then that what really happened in Ireland, might happen in Greece. I take this opportunity alſo to acknowledge, that, though previous to reading this paſſage in Mitford, I had written the greateſt part of this work, yet on opening his ingenious apology for Homer, which precedes the ſtory I have quoted, I was highly gratified to find ſo many of my arguments anticipated, and done ſuch ample juſtice to by that Gentleman, that I ſcarce had brought forward any anſwer to this part of Mr. Bryant's work, which was not ſanctioned by his high authority. See the whole of the ſection. (Mitford, ſect. 4. chap. 1.)

actuated

actuated only by the chivalrous motive * of recovering the frail runaway wife of Menelaus. † Achilles declares that he came thither from a perſonal regard to Agamemnon and Menelaus, the ſame motive might poſſibly influence many others; a ſtrong deſire of military fame formed another motive, for in thoſe days of piratical violence, the heroes who aſſerted the cauſe of juſtice, ſtood in the place of the Gods, and were almoſt revered as ſuch by the enthuſiaſtic gratitude of the nations they protected or avenged. Reſentment of a breach of hoſpitality was alſo an inducement, the more powerful ſince the curſe which muſt follow ſuch a crime in their idea almoſt inſured ſucceſs. But with numbers, no doubt, the chief allurement which the confederacy preſented was the promiſed plunder of Northern Aſia. The petty chieftains who, as Mr. Bryant juſtly obſerves, were continually engaged in a freebooting warfare, would as certainly unite when a greater plunder offered, and a large force was aſſembling for the purpoſe of obtaining it. Greece, at this moment, ſwarms with adventurous hordes who are ever ready to join in the wars of the Turkiſh Governors, and are frequently employed in the heart of Aſia, on whatever ſide the greateſt pay is to be acquired, or the greateſt plunder is to be expected. And yet we find that agriculture is neglected, piracy frequent, little communication between the provinces, in ſhort every characteriſtic of the early times, excepting their freedom and their honour. This analogy is unanſwerable, and we ſhall allow it the more eaſily when we find it acknowledged by Mr. Bryant himſelf, that

NOTE.

* Menelaus himſelf diſavows this motive in Euripides, and aſſigns that of revenge for the inſult he had received. See Troades.

† Hom. Il. i, 150.—Bryant on the Trojan War, p. 13.

Thucydides

Thucydides was aware of all theſe obnoxious circumſtances relative to the manners of the heroic ages and yet never conſidered them as objections to the truth of Homer's ſtory.

No analogy concluſive from the firſt Rape of Helen by Theſeus.

The ſame chapter however contains another objection of Mr. Bryant, in theſe words: "It ſeems ſtrange that ſo many Cities and States ſhould combine to regain her (Helen) when ſhe went away voluntarily, and that not a ſingle hamlet ſhould riſe in her favour when ſhe was carried away by force (by Theſeus) and in violation of the Goddeſs whom ſhe ſerved." There are many different accounts of this Rape of Helen, ſome of which are enumerated by Plutarch. Without conſidering the grounds of the ſtory, I do not perceive that it is at all "ſtrange" that the armament which took place againſt Troy ſhould not have been levied againſt Theſeus. In Mr. Bryant's account indeed we find that Caſtor and Pollux *alone* purſued him to recover her, and that they purſued him *immediately*; ſince he argues from their age that Helen was then a woman. In this however there is much inaccuracy. Her brothers purſued her; but not till they had * levied a conſiderable force. They beſieged Athens during the abſence of Theſeus in Epirus, and after defeating the Athenian forces, near Aphydne, took that fortreſs where they recovered their ſiſter. Theſe particulars are alſo from Plutarch, with many other circumſtances which ſhew the generality of theſe traditional ſtories. Since Caſtor and Pollux did in fact collect forces ſufficient to recover their ſiſter and revenge the inſult offered them, there was certainly no occaſion for a more numerous armament; neither was the houſe of Tyndarus powerful

See Plutarch, Theſeus.

NOTE.

* From whence were theſe forces levied, if not a ſingle hamlet would furniſh them?

enough by its alliances and opulence, to aſſemble round it ſuch auxiliaries as were afterwards convened under the more promiſing auſpices of the ſons of Atreus. When Mr. Bryant therefore concludes, that the whole hiſtory is a fable inconſiſtent from the beginning to the end, the reader muſt decide whether the arguments he has hitherto brought forward will juſtify ſuch a general concluſion.

War of Troy recorded by Thucydides.

*In his next chapter which we now come to conſider, Mr. Bryant begins with an acknowledgement which will have much weight with all who are inclined to give credit to the common ſenſe of ancient Greece. "Thucydides," he ſays, "though ſagacious and a lover of truth, could not ſet aſide the hiſtory of the Trojan war;" the Glory and Religion of his country were too much intereſted in the belief of that event. But we do not find that this hiſtorian ever attempts to *ſet aſide* the ſtory of the Trojan war, nor are we authoriſed to attribute to him any ſuch motives for his preſervation of it; on the contrary, he gives it a formal hiſtorical ſanction. He relates it as a well known fact, and when we conſider the many opportunities he had of examining the truth, and the multitude of collateral teſtimonies which time and barbariſm have ſince annihilated, we cannot avoid giving ſome credit to the deliberate opinion of an hiſtorian ſo judicious, and an age ſo enlightened. Without reſting our defence however upon his authority, let us conſider the objections which Mr. Bryant raiſes from his narration. He had told us that before this event the Grecians had done nothing in common, that they were in an uncertain and roving ſtate. He deſcribes the Pelaſgi as *wandering* in the country, where in conſequence of their want of ſecurity there was no traffick and little correſpondence. It was uncertain

Want of civiliſation no argument againſt the war.

NOTE.

* "The farther improbability of this hiſtory." Mr. Bryant on the war of Troy, p. 16.

into

into what hands their treaſures or harveſts might fall, ſo that commerce and agriculture were equally neglected. "How comes it then," ſays Mr. Bryant, "that juſt at this criſis they ſhould unite to recover a runaway woman, and that a hundred thouſand men ſhould aſſemble from thoſe ſtates, which could collect only ten thouſand men at Marathon, and ſcarce ſeven thouſand at Thermopylæ."

We will for one moment pauſe here to obſerve the little analogy between theſe events and the expedition of the Grecians againſt Troy. The army of Marathon conſiſted of Athenians alone, if we except one thouſand Platæans, who were their only allies in the combat. The troops of Leonidas were ſent to defend a narrow defile, till a larger army could be levied to oppoſe the enemy; in both caſes the Grecian forces conſiſted of a few heroes raiſed in haſte to prevent a ſurprize, till their countrymen could prepare a more effectual reſiſtance. At the battle of Platæa it ſeems their army was much larger; it conſiſted according to Mr. Bryant of 72,500 men, *excluding the Helots*; but as theſe alſo were Greeks we may include them, and we ſhall find that the whole army conſiſted of (ενδεκα μυριαδες) 110,000 men. It will be remembered alſo that the Greeks were arming both by ſea and land at the ſame time, and that at the battle of Mycale no ſmall force was engaged with the Perſians on the very day of the action at Platæa.* It

NOTE.

* Liſt of the Forces at Platæa according to Herodotus.

	Men.
Laconians and Spartans	10,000
Tegeates,	1,500
Corinthians,	5,000
Potidæans,	300
Arcadian Orchomenians,	600
Sicyonians,	3,000

Epidaurians,

It will be obſerved alſo, that theſe were levied from a * much ſmaller diſtrict than the armament againſt Troy, and at a time when many States of Greece were divided from the league by

NOTES.

	Men.
Brought forward	20,400
Epidaurians,	800
Træzenians,	1,000
Lepreatæ,	200
Mycenænas and Tirynthians,	400
Phliaſians,	1,000
Hermioneans,	300
Eretrians and Styrenſes,	600
Chalcidenſes	400
Ampracians,	500
Leucadians and Anactorienſes	800
Paleenſes,	200
Æginates,	500
Megarenſes,	3,000
Platæans,	600
Athenians,	8,000
Unarmed Theſpians,	1,800
Light Armed Greeks,	34,500
Light Armed Helots,	35,000
Total	110,000 ενδεκα μυριαδες
Deduct Helots,	35,000
Remain,	75,000
Deduct the unarmed Theſpians,	1,800
Remain,	73,200

Therefore Mr. Bryant's ſtatement of 72,500 is inaccurate even on his own principles. Herodot. b. ix, p. 597.

* Liſt of the Diſtricts which furniſhed Troops for the Siege of Troy :

Bœotia, Phocis, Locris, Euboea, Athens, Salamis, Argolis, Mycenæ, Sicyon and Corinth, Achaia, Laconia, Meſſenia, Arcadia, Elis, Iſlands on the Weſt Coaſts, Acarnania and Ætolia, Crete, Rhodes, Iſlands on the South of the Ægean, and Theſſaly.

their

their politics, or weakened by inteſtine diviſions. It ſeems ſtrange to Mr. Bryant " that an army like that at Platæa ſhould be thought an extraordinary exertion, at a time when Greece abounded both in wealth and men; and yet that ſhe ſhould be able in the rude ages deſcribed by * Thucydides, to levy and ſupport ſo extraordinary an armament as that under Agamemnon." But our aſtoniſhment will ceaſe when we reflect that the barbarous and unciviliſed ages of the world have ever furniſhed armies whoſe numbers in civiliſed times are almoſt deemed fabulous. To produce ſome inſtances of this: We find in Pauſanias, that when the Celtæ invaded Greece, under Brennus, the numbers of the Barbarian army amounted to no leſs than 152,000 foot and 61,200 horſemen, in all to 213,200 effective men. The Cimbri and Teutones, whom Marius conquered, brought into the field againſt him 300,000 effective men, according to Plutarch, an army which would be hardly levied in modern Germany, with every advantage of wealth and civiliſation. The Gauls, who in the time of the Republic ſacked and burnt the City of Rome, and the Huns, Goths, and Vandals, of later times, aſſembled troops which aſtoniſh almoſt to incredulity, thoſe who compare them with the modern population of Northern Europe. The very circumſtances of rudeneſs and barbariſm which form the ground work of Mr. Bryant's argument, are in reality the proofs of its futility. Armies are much ſooner levied in barbarous and unciviliſed countries, where no commerce employs the in-

NOTE.

* Thucydides himſelf thought ſo differently upon this ſubject, that he expreſsly tells us the armies of the Greeks under Agamemnon were leſs than might be expected from the extent and population of the diſtricts which levied them; a circumſtance he attributes to the difficulty of victualling a larger army in thoſe days. Thucyd. l. i. c. 10, 11.

duſtry of mankind, no agriculture attaches them to their native ſoil, and where in conſequence the whole population conſiſts of roving adventurers, ever ready to aſſemble from deſire of military fame, or the ſtronger inducements of plunder. We muſt alſo allow for the amplification of tradition, and we muſt naturally ſuppoſe the Greek Poet would endeavour to enhance the glory of his country by adopting the greateſt number which that tradition afforded. If he candidly conſider all this, I believe the reader will hardly acquieſce in Mr. Bryant's concluſion againſt the poſſibility of the expedition.

Concerning the ſhips mentioned. BRYANT, page 18.

The next objection which Mr. Bryant makes to Homer's hiſtory, is founded on the incredibility of ſo great a number of ſhips being fitted out for the Trojan expedition, by States which contributed ſo few to the battles of Salamis and Artemiſium. In the firſt place we will obſerve that the analogy between either of theſe inſtances and the Trojan armament, is not ſufficiently cloſe any way to juſtify Mr. Bryant's concluſion relative to the comparative force of the States at theſe different æras. The ſhips which tranſported Homer's heroes to Phrygia, were ſuch as in thoſe times were made uſe of indifferently for the purpoſes of commerce, piracy, and war, and ſuch as the numerous Sea Ports and Iſlands of Greece might be very well ſuppoſed to poſſeſs; but the veſſels which were oppoſed to the naval force of Perſia, were armed Triremes and Pentecontores, built for the expreſs purpoſes of war, and furniſhed not by individuals as in the caſe of Troy, but by the ſeparate States, moſt of which, if we except Attica, were as yet nearly unprovided with a public naval force. It is then very poſſible that the ports of the Peloponneſus might poſſeſs at this early period 430 veſſels fit for the purpoſes of tranſports, and yet not be able to equip above 89 ſhips of war

See Thucydides, l. i. ch. 9, 10, and 11.

war for the ſea fight of Artemiſium * and Salamis. What renders this ſtill more probable is the fluctuating nature of commerce, and of maritime force in conſequence. In fact we find that Athens which had alone attended carefully to her naval eſtabliſhment, fitted out no fewer than 147 veſſels to the ſea fight at Artemiſium, 20 of which were manned by Chalcidians, and afterwards at Salamis furniſhed 180 Triremes, beſides 20 which were lent to the Chalcidians. Athens therefore furniſhed more veſſels than double the whole force of the Peloponneſus, ſo little did the ſhipping of the ancients depend upon the comparative population of the country. In Homer's time or rather in Agamemnon's, † My-

NOTES.

* Liſt of forces ſent to Artemiſium.

	Triremes.	
From Lacedæmon	10	States of Peloponneſus.
From Corinth	40	
From Sicyon	12	
From Epidaurus	8	
From Træzene	5	
Total	75 Triremes.	
ADD TO THESE		
Chalcidians	20	
Athenians	127	
Megarenſes	20	
Ægina	12	
Eretria	7	
Styrea	2	
Cios	2	2 Pentecontores.
Locri		7 Pentecontores.
Total force of the Greeks	265 Trir. 9 Pentecontores.	

* Liſt of ſhips ſent to Salamis.

	Triremes.	
From Lacædemon	16	States of Peloponneſus.
From Sicyon	15	
From Epidaurus	10	
From Træzene	5	
From Corinth	40	
From Hermione	3	
Total	89	
ADD TO THESE		
Athens	180	
Megara	20	
Ampracia	7	
Leucadia	3	
Ægina	30	
Chalcis	20	
Eretria	7	
Melos, Syphnos, and Seriphos		4 Pentecontores.
Cios	2	2 Pentecontores.
Naxos	4	
Styrea	2	
Cynthos	1	1 Pentecontores.
Crotona	1	
Total force of the Greeks	368 Trir. 7 Pentecontores.	

† Mr. Bryant denies the accounts given us by the ancient writers concerning Mycenæ. I ſhall diſcuſs his objections in their turn. The reader ought to be apprized that the accounts here dwelt upon are from Strabo, Pauſanias, and Diodorus Siculus.

cenæ

cenæ and Argos were at the head of a flouriſhing country, which at the time of the Perſian war had declined, from the predominance of Sparta and Athens. The great Legiſlator of Sparta had not as yet forbid the Lacedemonians to engage in commerce, and it is probable that their maritime affairs were at this time on a much more conſiderable ſcale than they were for centuries after the Legiſlation of Lycurgus. We ſee then that a partial compariſon between the forces of the Peloponneſus at two periods ſo eſſentially different, is extremely fallacious; and if we extend the liſt to the forces of the Greeks in general we ſhall find that at Artemiſium they had no fewer than 265 Triremes, and 368 at Salamis. Theſe form a force more than equal in maritime ſtrength to Agamemnon's fleet of tranſports, and as far as the argument reſts upon the number of men, it is I apprehend anſwered in the laſt ſection.

In the concluding paragraph of this chapter, Mr. Bryant, diſmiſſing the conſideration of theſe comparative forces, brings another argument againſt the poſſibility of the expedition. It was a long time, he ſays, before the Greeks ventured to traverſe the Ægean, and quotes Libanius* to prove that they never ventured farther than Delos. Whatever might be the ſtate of Greece afterwards, we have the ſtrongeſt ground for believing this aſſertion to be falſe at the time when Homer wrote. In fact how can we ſuppoſe that a nation was thus entirely ignorant of ſea affairs, who were themſelves imported into Greece and Aſia, by Tyrian and Egyptian fleets, conſiderably prior to the Trojan expedition. The early intercourſe with the latter, to which Mr. Bryant refers even the ſtory of the Iliad, and

NOTE.

* Libanius was tutor to Julian, and his authority therefore reſpecting the ſtate of early Greece, is entitled to very little attention (if any) when controverted by the ancient hiſtorians.

the

the family of Homer himſelf, prove ſufficiently that the navigation to Egypt by Crete, was well known, through a ſtormy expanſe of water far more dangerous than the ſeas which ſeparate Greece from Troy, in all which they could eaſily run by day from iſland to iſland, or along the coaſts. Indeed prior to the Iliad we hear of an expedition to Colchos; but without having recourſe to what looks like fable, I will aſk if the fact is not ſufficiently proved by the hiſtory of the times? *From Diodorus Siculus we receive the following account of the Cyclades, and maritime powers that poſſeſſed them in the early times. "Minos, the ſon of Jupiter and Europa, reigning in Crete, and having great forces *both naval* and military *held the Empire of the Sea*, and ſent many colonies from Crete. He civiliſed moſt of the Iſlands of the Cyclades, and divided them by lot amongſt the coloniſts; he alſo obliged great part of the Aſiatic coaſt to ſubmit to his dominion. Hence many of the ports of Aſia and Crete were in after ages called Minoæ. After this he joined Rhadamanthus his brother in the kingly authority, on account of the extent of his dominions, but becoming envious of his influence obliged him afterwards to leave Crete, and fly to the extremity of his colonial poſſeſſions; here he induced Erythrus to build the town of Erythræ on the coaſt of Ionia, and gave Œnopion, the ſon of Ariadne, the ſovereignty of Chios. And theſe things (ſays Diodorus) took place before the war of Troy. But after that event the Carians (*another maritime power*) conquered the iſland, and in part exterminated, in part ſubdued the Cretans; ſince which the Greeks becoming powerful ſupplanted the Carians in their turn, and vindicated their poſ-

NOTE.

* Μεγάλας δυνάμεις ἔχων πεζικὰς τε καὶ ναυτικὰς ἐθαλατοκράτει, &c. Diodor. Siculus, lib. v. p. 399. Edit. Weſſelingii. Fol. Amſtel. 1745.

ſeſſion of the iſlands." So far Diodorus. Theſe laſt conqueſts of the Greeks over the Carians took place not long after the war of Troy, at the time of the Ionic migration, of which the reader may find an account in the 14th book of Strabo, and a ſtill more minute one in the 7th book of Pauſanias, both of whom give the particulars of their colonization. Thucydides too, "ſagacious and a lover of truth," (for theſe are Mr. Bryant's own words reſpecting him) mentions the Carian and Phænician pirates, and the Empire of Minos over the Sea.† For, ſays he, the inhabitants of the Iſlands, at that time Carians and Phænicians, exerciſed conſtant piracy; but when Minos had eſtabliſhed a fleet, the ſeas became more navigable, for he drove many of the pirates out and ſettled colonies in the Iſlands. The Greeks, who before had chiefly lived inland, did now, as he tells us, remove their towns nearer to the ſea-ſhore for the ſake of commerce; the States of Greece aſſumed a more regular form, and thus, he proceeds, *having become powerful they afterwards warred with Troy.* Homer himſelf gives a very detailed account of the Phænicians; and Heſiod in his works and days, mentions the commerce of the times as much carried on by ſea. Such a maſs of authority will, I apprehend, be deemed a ſufficient anſwer to Mr. Bryant's inference from the almoſt modern Libanius.

But he ſtrengthens his argument ſtill farther by a quotation from Herodotus, who ſays that a fleet from Argolis and Sparta refuſed in the Perſian war to ſail beyond Delos.* Mr. Bryant it will be obſerved in this paſſage, puts a little daſh where

NOTES.

† Thucydides, l. i. ch. 8.

* Herodot. l. viii. c. 132. p. 682. Mr. Bryant on the War of Troy, p. 22.

a part

a part of the ſentence is omitted; but the reader ſhould be informed that the reſt of it runs thus, "All beyond ſeemed full of danger, as they had little knowledge of thoſe parts, *which appeared to them to be full of enemies.*" Their fears then proceeded from the dread of falling in with a ſuperior fleet. We ſhould alſo reflect, that ſoon after the Trojan wars, Greece underwent a cruel revolution. The thrones of the Peloponneſus were completely overturned: Mycenæ, Argos, and Lacedæmon, underwent a variety of changes; Athens was long torn by civil diſſentions; the Ionians, Æolians, and Dorians, were forced from their country, and the manners and civilization of Greece, of which Homer is at once a witneſs and a proof, were thrown back into a barbariſm from which neither their arts nor ſciences emerged till the age of the Piſiſtratidæ, which immediately preceded the time of the Perſian wars. Add to this, that Lycurgus had forbidden navigation to the Spartans who at this time commanded the Grecian fleet. However ignorant therefore they might be from ſubſequent diſuſe, we cannot ſuppoſe that they were in the ſame ignorance at the time of Agamemnon, when the ſea had been covered with Phænician and Egyptian coloniſts, who of courſe imported with them the naval arts of their native country.

The conduct of the Grecians on their diſembarkation, furniſhes Mr. Bryant with another objection; but notwithſtanding the abſurdity which he diſcovers in the whole of Homer's ſtory, I own I can ſee nothing in their conduct and proceedings on and after their landing in Troas, that is not highly probable, and ſtrictly conformable to the tactics of the time he repreſents. Upon the firſt appearance of the Greeks before Troy they were immediately oppoſed, and ſuffered ſome loſs; they nevertheleſs

effected

effected their landing and beat the enemy back into the city.* Of what followed we know but a ſmall part, the writings of Homer compriſing in detail no more than a few months of the tenth year. We only know that whilſt the attacks upon the town were ſuſpended, the coaſts of Thrace, Aſia, and the neighbouring Iſlands, were ravaged by the Grecian army; that ſome of the Grecians, and particularly Achilles, diſtinguiſhed themſelves by this warfare of pillage; that the camp was by this means ſupplied with proviſions, and that the different independent forces which combined in the war were kept together by a participation in the plunder. Agamemnon would have ſhewn himſelf a very impolitic general if he had acted otherwiſe, and by a tedious inveſtment of a ſtrongly fortified place, diſguſted and wearied out men who cared little for the termination of the war, provided the proſecution of it was attended with profit to them individually. Homer's ſilence on this ſubject by no means proves that no attacks were made upon the city in all this time. The ſhips were ſometimes employed on theſe expeditions; ſometimes inland in-

Homer, Il. l. ix. v. 325.

curſions were made, the plunder was brought to Agamemnon, who divided it amongſt the Chiefs. Theſe aſſaults weakened the powers of Phrygia, and were perhaps deſigned to ſtraiten the city for want of proviſions. It is poſſible, in the mean time, that many events happened with which we are unacquainted; but it will not be eaſy to prove from Homer that the army acted with the abſurdity Mr. Bryant aſcribes to them, ſince Homer ſays little or nothing about the army in all this time.

NOTE.

* I ſhall ſo frequently have occaſion to make uſe of this ſame anſwer to Mr. Bryant's arguments in the following chapters that I muſt warn the reader before-hand, that the point I wiſh to prove is only the general truth of Homer's ſtory, not that he relates every detailed circumſtance which happened during the war; in ſhort, that the Iliad is true upon the whole, though it be not what Mr. Bryant ſeems to expect—a Trojan Gazette.

Yet

On the exaggerated ſuperiority of the Grecian heroes.

Yet it is a matter of wonder to him, that the Grecians ſhould with ſuperior forces, and heroes of ſuch diſtinguiſhed proweſs, be nine years unable to make any effectual attack upon a city, which Patroclus could have taken in a few hours, and which Achilles was on the point of ſtorming in one day but for the intervention of Apollo. Nevertheleſs we ſhall hardly join in this opinion if we reflect on the real ſtrength of Troy, and the difficulty in thoſe barbarous ages which attended the ſtorming of a fortified city. The machines of war for that purpoſe were as yet not invented, and it muſt be obvious to every one, that though the Trojans with an inferior army might not be able to cope with their enemies *in battle*, they might be extremely well able to defend their town.* But it would be an inſult to the reader's underſtanding to dwell long upon the comparative ſuperiority of the Grecian heroes; Homer's national partiality is evident through his book, and the exaggerated hyperboles on the more than mortal might of Achilles and Patroclus are beautiful, but ſurely flattering compliments to the prejudices of his countrymen. Indeed we find from his teſtimony, that great as were the wonders which he ſays the valour of his countrymen "*might have*" performed, their hopes, were always unluckily diſappointed; and Troy fell at laſt by an adventurous ſtratagem. But enough of this; for a more ſerious argument is contained in the next paragraph.

Objection ariſing from the unfrequency of winter ſieges prior to the Peloponneſian war, conſidered.

There is no inſtance, according to Mr. Bryant, of any Grecian army carrying on a ſiege in winter till the Peloponneſian war, and at that time the Lacedemonians generally contented themſelves with inroads into Attica, and never inveſted Athens. That in thoſe barbarous ages armies were with difficulty kept together to proſecute a tedious ſiege, is very true;

NOTE.

* In a ſubſequent age we find the Romans engaged for ten years before Veii; the forces of which could not reſiſt them in the field.

but we have ſeen in this caſe that the war was frequently not ſo much a ſiege of Troy as an attack upon the whole Phrygian dominions. When they firſt landed they probably expected to carry the place by a coup de main; they were diſappointed, the winter came on; where in fact could they go? the Thracians were hoſtile; the Ægean was impaſſable; they were therefore obliged to encamp. The difficulty of their ſubſiſtence accounts for their plundering the towns upon the coaſt; and I would aſk whether, allowing that a winter campaign was never thought of before the Peloponneſian war, we can any way account for Homer's prophetic imagination? How in effect can we ſuppoſe, that a poet who is ſo accurate a deſcriber of the manners of his times, would in a feigned ſtory ſo openly violate all probability. Homer being therefore himſelf prior to the æra of the Peloponneſian war, it follows that Mr. Bryant's aſſertion proves too much. We read, however, of great diſcontents in the army, the natural conſequence of ſo long a ſiege, and they appear always to be kept together by * emulation, ſhame of being baffled, proſpects of plunder, hope of a ſpeedy ſurrender, and a natural unwillingneſs to abandon an object which had coſt them ſo much trouble. Such is the conduct of nature in ſimilar circumſtances, and ſuch is recorded by Homer.

Objection from the ſuppoſed decay of the Shipping, conſidered.

† Mr. Bryant now ſtarts another objection, for he aſſerts that

NOTES.

* In the Second Book of Homer the Grecians are repreſented as on the point of quitting the ſiege, and are kept only by theſe motives being held out to them in the ſpeeches of the different leaders. See thoſe of Ulyſſes, Agamemnon, Neſtor, &c. Il. ii. paſſim.

† The whole of this argument depends on the degree of decay, which it is neceſſary to allot to the Grecian veſſels. Mr. Bryant maintains that they were totally uſeleſs at the time, and alſo irreparable, as he cannot ſuppoſe that the Greeks could ſail back in them. Agamemnon on the contrary aſſerts only that they were decayed in their timbers and rigging, but employs them afterwards to return. Can Mr. Bryant prove the impoſſibility of Agamemnon's being right, and that he did not repair them for the purpoſe of returning?

the

the ſhipping of the Greeks muſt, by a ten years anchorage, have been rendered totally unfit for ſervice. Agamemnon, who mentions the decay of their rigging, confeſſes that he had loſt a number of men during the ſiege, and yet no mention is made of recruits. We muſt remember that the Iliad only records the events of a few months, ſo that Homer's ſilence on theſe ſubjects proves literally nothing relative to the reſt of the time during which the ſiege is ſaid to have laſted.* We know that the ſhipping was conſtantly employed along the coaſt, and that coaſt abounds every where with materials fit for repairing a fleet, particularly the lower parts of Mount Ida. † Is it neceſſary to ſuppoſe that the ſhips were never repaired, becauſe they are never mentioned as undergoing that operation during the time the army were more immediately engaged in the ſiege, that is to ſay, for a few months of the tenth year? At the time to which Agamemnon alludes, the rigging might want repairing; we ſuppoſe before they ſailed it was repaired. From the quotation,‡ which Mr. Bryant gives at the end of this chapter, he infers that Menelaus uſed the ſame ſhips for eight years after the deſtruction of Troy. Homer's words are ἐν νηυσὶ *in ſhips*, and whether they were never repaired or

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. l. ix. p 325.

† The ſhips of Æneas were conſtructed from the woods of Ida. Virgil. Æn. l. iii. v. 6.—l. xi. 80.

‡ Such a detail of the rigging and repairs would hardly be found now in Lloyd's liſt, though profeſſedly a nautical Journal. Is an Epic Poem a verſified Newſpaper?

Odyſſ. l. iv. ver. 81, 82. ——— Ἦ γὰρ πολλὰ παθὼν καὶ πολλ' ἐπαληθεὶς.
Ἠγαγόμην ἐν νηυσὶ καὶ ὀγδοάτῳ ἔτει ἦλθον.

In this paſſage I can find not one word that proves what ſhips Menelaus poſſeſſed, or how they had been built, or how often repaired. That he brought his wealth to Greece "in ſhips," is all that is ſaid, and without a very curious inland march, I do not ſee how he could carry it thither any other way.

rebuilt

rebuilt is a ſubject on which he is totally ſilent. There are many ſea boats in England whoſe duration has been greater than that of any of their veſſels. The other objection of their not being recruited is equally founded on Homer's ſilence. We read however of the recruits brought afterwards by Pyrrhus; and allowing the argument in its fulleſt extent, it will only prove that the army muſt have been greatly weakened before the tenth year. This is exactly what is recorded of them, and they were ſo diſpirited that they were repeatedly on the point of abandoning the ſiege; and Troy at laſt fell only by a well-timed ſtratagem.

Homer's ſilence no proof that there was little Correſpondence between Greece and the army. †

We now come to another argument drawn alſo chiefly from the ſilence of Homer. We do not find, it is true, any mention of a regular correſpondence, which was owing to the circumſtances of the times; but that there was no intercourſe at all cannot be inferred from Homer's not having recorded it. From different accidents they might ſometimes not hear from Greece for a conſiderable time, and thus * Achilles is very naturally made to expreſs a concern about his abſent friends whoſe fate he was little acquainted with. Penelope was ſtill farther ſeparated from Ulyſſes, (whoſe ten years voyage is recorded) by the ſtormy ſea which waſhes the ſouthern coaſts of the Peloponneſus, a ſea which long continued to be thought dangerous, even when navigation was in a more advanced ſtate. The private conduct of ſome of the Ladies during the abſence of their huſbands, and the domeſtic diſſentions which agitated their courts long before the tenth year, will account for the communication not being very ſolicitouſly kept up.

NOTES.

† On the little correſpondence of Greece with the army. Bry. p. 27.

* That Achilles had ſome intelligence appears from his own ſpeech, quoted in Mr. Bryant, p. 28. Ζώειν μὰν ἔτι φασὶ Μενοίτιον, &c. they ſay that Menætius is alive, &c. Hom. Il. xvi. v. 14.

The

The next arguments againſt the Trojan war are inferred from the age of Helen at that time. They turn upon a chronology given by Scaliger, Petavius and Clemens Alexandrinus.† On this chronology, however, ſays Mr. Bryant, I place not the leaſt truſt; and indeed in his firſt chapter he had fixed the Olympiads as the earlieſt æra of all Grecian hiſtory, which cannot be ſuppoſed ſubſequent to accurate chronology, though it is eaſy to ſuppoſe the reverſe. All inferences, therefore, drawn from ſuch grounds, are inadmiſſible, and the objection is anſwered. Many inconſiſtent accounts are given of the heroic ages, which theſe chronologers have in vain endeavoured to reconcile; but they no where affect the uniform conſiſtency of Homer, who ſcarce mentions one of the accounts here alluded to, and the exiſtence of Troy, as far as it reſts on his authority, is unſhaken by the argument.

No inferences to be drawn from a chronology acknowledged imperfect.*

‖ The ſtory of the covenant entered into by the lovers of Helen is

Lovers of Helen unnoticed by Homer.‡

NOTES.

* Inferences made from the age of Helen. Bry. p. 29.

† The moſt grave and judicious hiſtorians and other writers of antiquity have, it is true, endeavoured in vain to eſtabliſh the chronology of the fall of Troy; but though the difficulties attending on ſuch an effort may be accounted for by the uncertainty of theſe early dates, yet this defect would be a moſt extraordinary reaſon for aboliſhing all faith in the event, of which the exiſtence being acknowledged has actuated the wiſeſt men to aim at aſcertaining the time when it took place. Beſides thoſe writers ſo often mentioned in this work, we find this epoch made uſe of repeatedly by very literary men. Eratoſthenes of Cyrene, invited from Athens *to Egypt* by Ptolemy Euergetes, compleated an imperfect ſeries of *Ægyptian* Kings in Greek "et ſui Thebanorum regum laterculi terminum ad Trojæ ἅλωσιν poſuit, P. p. 3. v. 249." Dicæarchus Meſſenius was a hearer of Ariſtotle, "ille *Ægyptiaca tempora* tractavit, Dicæarchus etiam in animo habuit ad Excidium Ilii calculum ponere." The Arundel marbles, of which the authority is defended by Sir John Maſham, (p. 15.) give us the date of the time ἀφ' ὃ τροία ἥλω. The Chronographium of Thraſyllus, as preſerved in Clemens Alexandrinus, aſſumes the fall of Troy as an epoch. This ancient writer as well as Clemens Alexandrinus acquieſces in the truth of the tale of Troy. Clemens. Stromata. l. i. p. 335. Sir John Maſham, p. 295.

‡ On the lovers and ſuitors of Helen. Bry. p. 32.

‖ Mr. Bryant aſſerts Homer to have been acquainted with the improbable ſtory of Helen's rival lovers, and quotes a line from the Iliad;

is no where mentioned in Homer, and is I believe unnoticed by the very early authors. It is one of thoſe fables engrafted on the hiſtory of a remarkable event by after ages; and if it proves any thing at all, it corroborates the fact, by ſhewing that there were *traditions relative to it which were not tranſcribed from Homer, and conſequently that the original foundation of the ſtory does not ariſe merely from his imagination. The remainder of the argument, which reſts upon a chronological calculation of the ages of Helen's lovers, is for that reaſon defective, ſince I have already mentioned how little we are acquainted with the chronology of this early æra.

Inland ſituation of Arcadia conſidered.

†Mr. Bryant draws his next objection from the inland ſituation of the Arcadians. Homer tells us, it is true, that their ſhips were procured for them by Agamemnon, but does not tell us who taught them to row, ſteer, and manage the ſails. Hence concluding that nobody did teach them, he finds it difficult to account for their getting to Troy; he allows at the ſame time that they had ten years preparation, and obſerves that they could have no room for ſupernumeraries ſince there was the full complement of their own people, for which aſſertion he quotes a line from the Iliad.‡ I have already cautioned the Engliſh reader againſt Mr. Bryant's

NOTES.

Πῆ δὴ συνθεσίαι τε καὶ ὅρκια βήσεται ἡμῖν;
"*In what will our Engagements and Oaths terminate?*" Hom. Il. l. ii. v. 339.

This line is interpreted by the Scholiaſt as alluding to that event, but the obvious alluſion is, I think, to the general league formed at Aulis, and not to any prior confederacy.

* For ſome of theſe traditions, See Pauſanias, l. iii. p. 262.

† Of the Arcadian Allies. Bry. p. 34.

‡ ——— πολέες δ' ἐν νηῒ ἑκάστῃ
Ἀρκάδες ἄνδρες ἔβαινον ἐπισάμενοι πολεμόιο. Hom. Il. ii. 610.

Bryant's quotations; I will tranſlate this line for his benefit: "*In each ſhip there went many Arcadians ſkilled in war.*" Whether theſe Arcadians had other ſailors on board or not the quotation cannot prove, though an inattentive reader ſeeing a Greek line ſo boldly adduced, might eaſily take the aſſertion for granted. With ſuch ſmall veſſels as depended chiefly on rowing, and with ſuch ſimple rigging as their veſſels had, it required no great naval ſkill to manage them; and if the previous knowledge of the Arcadians was ſo little, we may ſuppoſe them mixt with a few ſeamen from the other ſhips, and reflect what a great proportion of landmen are ſometimes on board our own fleet at this day.

The Foſs and Rampart ſuch as to be eaſily obliterated.

* Homer aware that no Foſs or Rampart exiſted in his time in the plain of Troy, accounts for the deſtruction of this work of the Grecians by a miraculous intervention of Jupiter, Neptune, and Apollo. Jupiter he ſays poured down inceſſant rains, whilſt Neptune and Apollo, directed againſt it the weight of all the rivers of Ida, whoſe force perhaps ſwollen with ſhowers, and collected in the Helleſpont, he ſuppoſed was the cauſe of the inundation that overwhelmed the rampart. Now had ſuch a foſs and rampart exiſted, Mr. Bryant is of opinion that no time could deſtroy it, and that therefore this was only an artifice of the poet to reconcile his ſtory to the actual appearance of the plain. There are many foſſes and ramparts in our iſland which will probably remain for ever. That theſe works are ſometimes very durable I am ready to grant, but the argument is whether they are never deſtroyed, for if I can bring one example of an encampment mentioned in ancient authors, which has been ſince obliterated, it

NOTE.

* Concerning the Foſs and Rampart. Bry. p. 35.

will

will be impoſſible for Mr. Bryant to ſhew why that of the Grecians ſhould not have ſhared the ſame fate.

Let us however conſider the nature of the Grecian Camp. It is defended by a wall and a ditch; between theſe there was ſome ſpace, ſince the Trojans having paſſed the ditch carry on an obſtinate battle before the wall in the 12th book.* Of the ſize of each we ſhall there find alſo a very ſufficient intimation: When the Trojans came to it they ſtopped, for, ſays he, "it was *not eaſy* to leap over it; and there was a difficulty in paſſing through it, ſince the ſides were very ſteep, and the upper part fenced with paliſadoes." Nay more, we find that Hector actually did leap over it, and Patroclus afterwards.† Ditch, rampart, and paliſadoes were then within the compaſs of a deſperate leap, and as ſuch much leſs conſiderable than the Saxon remains in this iſland, which have proved ſo durable. The ſize of the wall we may diſcover alſo from another part of the ſame book, where we find that Sarpedon approaches it, "and ſeizing the battlement with a ſtrong hand drags it down; it falls, and a breach is thus made in the wall." ‡ The height of it was, we ſee, little more than that of a man, and the ſtrength of it certainly not ſuch as to reſiſt long the attacks of time. We cannot indeed ſuppoſe it very conſiderable, as we find it only undertaken by the Grecians during the abſence of Achilles, ‖ and that it was the work of one ſingle day. I will add that the extreme marſhineſs of the mouth of the Scamander, during winter, would account for the deſtruction of a much greater work. The manner in which the rampart was deſtroyed is a ſubject alſo of ſome animadverſion. Homer's gods di-

NOTE.

* Hom. Il. l. xii. ver. 53. and ſeq.—† Hom. Il. l. xvi. ver. 368, 380.—‡ Hom. Il. l. xii. ver. 397. and ſeq.—‖ Hom. Il. l. vii. ver. 433, 465.

rect

rect againſt it the force of many rivers which flow in different directions. As all theſe rivers however flow either into the Propontis or Helleſpont, above the Rhætean, they may perhaps by Homer be repreſented as co-operating with the Scamander in cauſing an inundation at its mouth. At all events the point here only tends to define the power of Homer's gods, to which I certainly am not competent; but ſhould the whole ſtory be as falſe as Mr. Bryant wiſhes to prove it, and ſhould the rampart only be introduced to vary the monotony of Homer's Epic Battles, the hiſtorical fact of Greece arming againſt and taking Troy, in ſhort the whole ground-work of the poem would ſtill remain unimpeached; though we have (as far as I can ſee) no reaſon to make him ſo liberal a conceſſion.

For ſome pages Mr. Bryant now conſiders the ſituation of Troy and the deſcription of the plain as given us by Homer. As I ſhall in the ſecond part of this work diſcuſs the topography of the country, more particularly, the reader will there find an anſwer to his arguments, as well as to every other where he treats of the preſent and former ſtate of the country. I ſhall alſo conſider there the attempt which he has in another work made on the ingenious publication of Monſieur Le Chevalier, and where theſe ideas are more fully detailed. At preſent I ſhall confine myſelf to the charges brought againſt the Iliad from the nature of the ſtory, and ſuſpend theſe topographical arguments till I have prepared the reader to feel all their juſtice.

Mr. Bryant having, as he imagines, completely ſatisfied us that the hiſtory of the Trojan war, as given by Homer and the other Grecian authors, is an abſolute fiction, proceeds then to fulfil the promiſe of his preface* to build up a ſyſtem of his own; but as I

NOTE.

* See Bryant's Preface to the Diſſertation on the War of Troy. Page 6.

cannot perceive the ſucceſs of his firſt attempt to ſubvert, ſo whilſt the old building remains unſhaken, it will not be expected that I ſhould acknowledge the value of his modern edifice. As however the foundations of this latter ſeem to be rather unſtable, ſo its ruins will ſerve to prop and repair the cracks and flaws made by time in the venerable original.

Abſtract of Mr. BRYANT's conjectures concerning Homer.

Previous to his bringing forward the grand * hypotheſis which his whole book reſts upon, that the ſtory of Troy was originally from Egypt, Mr. Bryant paves the way for its reception by a conjecture concerning the life and writings of Homer. He accordingly ſuppoſes that Homer was of a Grecian family which had long reſided in Egypt and was in ſome degree allied to the Egyptians, this family by a ſecond migration came and ſettled in Greece, bringing with them many traditions and many rites of the country whence they came. Theſe traditions then according to him were the ground-work of the Iliad, in which he only ſubſtituted Greek derivative names for Egyptian ones. *He was moreover a great traveller—curious—feeling—gloomy—and ſuperſtitious.*†—Many of his hiſtories have an immediate reference to Egyptian cuſtoms. Of theſe Mr. Bryant concludes his chapter by giving ſome inſtances.

Homer's knowledge of Egyptian cuſtoms no proof of Mr. BRYANT's conjectures concerning him.

That Homer was well acquainted with Egypt certainly appears from ſome of theſe paſſages, unleſs we ſuppoſe them founded on traditions and cuſtoms which had come from thence before his

NOTES.

* Conjectures concerning the two Poems, the Iliad and Odyſſey, and concerning the Author. BRYANT, p. 53.

† See BRYANT, p. 54.

time,

time, and were already naturalized in Greece. His extenſive travels might lead him into Egypt, where he may have become acquainted with the ſacred myſteries of that ſuperſtitious people. Theſe he tranſpoſed as ornaments to his work. Yet the truth is, that except the character which he has ſtamped of his own mind in his two immortal poems, our knowledge concerning him is nothing but conjecture. What Mr. Bryant ſays of his life therefore in this chapter * farther than conjecture, is of no weight; notwithſtanding his well known erudition, his authority on this ſubject is on a level with that of the moſt ignorant. Let us grant however that Homer's family was originally from Egypt, it is evident that the Greeks too who were in great part from Egypt, and who had borrowed much of their religion from that country, were probably at this time cloſe imitators of their models, and had retained many Egyptian cuſtoms which were afterwards forgotten. Of theſe the averſion to fiſh was probably one; the deification of the nine Muſes another; the title of "Shepherds of the † People" it is poſſible might be a third; but it is alſo poſſible that many of theſe cuſtoms were imported into Greece at its firſt colonization, and that Homer might notice them without any reference to the Egyptians. In whatever point of view however we conſider theſe ſtories we ſhall find they ſtand merely as unimportant ornamental circumſtances

NOTES.

* Thoſe who wiſh to be convinced how many various and contradictory accounts have been given us of Homer's Biography, will find them recorded in the ingenious Eſſay on the Life and Writings of Homer, affixed to Pope's tranſlation of the Iliad. The contradictions objected to in the ſtory here diſcuſſed are trifling in the compariſon. Did Homer therefore never exiſt?

† "The Lord is my Shepherd." "Give ear, oh! Shepherd of Iſrael," are terms found in the ſacred writings; the figure and idea conveyed, both there and here are obvious enough to have occurred both to David and Homer, without any reference to the Shepherd Kings of Egypt; alſo Ezek. xxxiv. 23. and many other paſſages of the ſame import throughout the Scriptures.

in

in the Iliad,* and it is much eaſier to ſuppoſe theſe introduced from Egypt to embelliſh a Grecian ſtory, than to believe that they are the only pure original parts of ſo complicated a ſtructure.

Ancient accounts of Homer too various and uncertain to be dwelt upon.

† Many writers quoted by Tatian and Clemens Alexandrinus were of opinion that Homer was an Egyptian. Ptolomy Hepheſtion, an author quoted by Photius, tells us that a woman of Memphis named Phantaſia, compoſed an account of the Trojan war before Homer, and an Odyſſea; that theſe books were depoſited at Memphis, and that Homer obtained a copy of theſe hiſtories from Phanites, a Scribe, and hence compoſed his poems. The ancient accounts concerning Homer are ſo uncertain and contradictory that no ſatisfactory anſwer can be made to thoſe who admit the obſcure opinions quoted by Tatian and Clemens. For a more detailed account of theſe inconſiſtent fables I would wiſh to refer the reader to the peruſal of an ingenious Eſſay quoted by Mr. Bryant, and prefixed to Pope's Verſion of Homer. Ptolomy's ſtory, and ſeveral others of the ſame nature are there treated with contempt, and the author makes a reflection which may be ſomewhat to the purpoſe here, that "it is an odd and contradictory induſtry in man which raiſes up the names of obſcure works to perſuade us that the moſt beautiful poem of the ancients was taken out of them. A beggar may be content to patch up his garment with what the world throws away, but it is never to be imagined an Emperor would make his robes of them."

NOTES.

* I do not at all ſee the neceſſity of this ſuppoſition, but I make it in order to put the argument uſed in what may be deemed the faireſt light, and to ſhew that no inference follows, even if we allow the premiſes aſſumed.

† Farther account of Homer and his connections with Egypt. BRYANT, p. 57.

Such,

Such, however, Mr. Bryant contends are the robes of Homer. Since Ptolomy appears to have been intimately acquainted with all the circumſtances of this Plagiary, we muſt admit his authority without reſerve, or reject it entirely as a miſtaken notion; according to his account the writings of the Memphian Prieſteſs treated of a war of *Ilium*, and an *Odyſſea*. What hitherto undiſcovered power of etymology can transfer *Ilium* or *Odyſſeus* into Egypt? We cannot but conclude that if the Egyptian Phantaſia wrote at all, ſhe wrote upon a Grecian ſtory. The improbability of this circumſtance is ſingly ſufficient to invalidate the account of Ptolomy.

Accounts of Phantaſia of Memphis highly improbable.

Every Lexicon will inform us that Phantaſia φαντασια is a Greek word derived from "φαινω, appareo;" but Mr. Bryant diving into all the depths of Coptic lore, finds the word Hant, or Hont, a Prieſt; then, by a national prefix, forms it into P'Hant, and he ſuppoſes that of the generic name of a Prieſteſs, the Greeks made the individual one of Phantaſia, or probably of P'Hant-Iſis, the Prieſteſs of Iſis, and on the faith of ſuch an etymology does he build his conjectures. If the reader has enough of this etymological enthuſiaſm to ſee the immediate connection between Phantaſia and P'Hant-Iſis, argument will be uſeleſs, I can only remind him, that there is no language upon earth which will not furniſh etymologies equally cloſe to ſupport any abſurdity * that the mind of man can invent.

Daphne of Thebes in Bœotia.

Daphne of Thebes is next brought forward, an Authoreſs mentioned in Diodorus Siculus, and we are told that Homer borrowed

NOTE.

* See Swift on the Antiquity of the Engliſh language.—"Si parva liceat componere magnis."

much of his ſtory from her; that "by Thebes was not meant Thebes in Bœotia, but Θηβαι Αιγυπτιοι εκαλομπολοι* Egyptian Thebes with its hundred gates." The paſſage alluded to in Diodorus however, expreſsly contradicts the whole of this aſſertion; it is as follows, "The †Epigoni after plundering the city of Thebes, conſecrated Daphne, the daughter of Tireſias, to the Prieſthood of Delphos."—"The genius of the girl was wonderful, and ſhe aſſiſted in verſifying many of the oracles with extraordinary ſucceſs. From her the Poet Homer borrowed many verſes to adorn his works." It is indeed very probable, that beautiful paſſages, and poetical expreſſions might be tranſpoſed by Homer into his book, but it is not equally eaſy to imagine, that the verſified reſponſes of the Pythian Apollo were the originals of the Iliad and Odyſſey, or even of the battle of the frogs and mice. But at all events, where is the connexion between Daphne and Egypt? The name of Thebes is found there, but it will be a wonderful effort of etymology that can diſplace Tireſias, the Epigoni, and Delphos, and at one ſweep eſtabliſh them all on the banks of the Nile. We may therefore juſtly doubt the apparently candid *indifference* which Mr. Bryant avows on this ſubject, ſince he could not be ignorant of the context and tendency of the paſſage he has thus brought forward. Inſtead of claiming the rights of neutrality, he ought therefore to have owned himſelf the ingenuous and determined ſupporter of a favorite hypotheſis, and boldly to have avowed his intention in the words of the poet: "Flectere ſi nequeo ſuperos, Acheronta movebo."

NOTES.

* I cannot perceive the reaſon for inſerting here this ſhort Greek paſſage, unleſs to inſinuate that it formed a part of Diodorus's text; at leaſt, ſuch is the impreſſion it is calculated to produce on an unguarded reader.

† Diodorus Siculus, l. iv. p. 269.

Mr.

The next authority quoted is an epitaph from the Greek Anthologia, aſſerting that Homer was a native of Thebes in Egypt, but our information concerning his birth is contradicted by ſo many different hiſtories, that they only tend to prove the complete ignorance of the ancients reſpecting him. "Strabo and Demetrius of Scepſis, *both ſearched* he ſays, and found no traces of a City of Troy in Phrygia." *Strabo, it is true, related what he heard from Demetrius of Scepſis, but there are very good grounds for believing that he did not *ſearch* himſelf, and indeed that he never was in the Troad. Notwithſtanding however the ill ſucceſs of his ſuppoſed ſearch, Strabo was ſo firmly perſuaded of the veracity of Homer that he every where quotes his authority, and a great part of his book is little more than a commentary on the Poet. "Yet" ſays Mr. Bryant "he found a Troy† in Egypt, a few miles below Memphis, and gives us a very accurate deſcription of its ſituation." We ſhall ſoon examine the juſtneſs of the concluſion which he endeavours to draw from this circumſtance; in the mean time I would wiſh to fix the attention of the reader upon the manner in which he has amplified this intereſting diſcovery. He quotes the paſſage from Strabo,‡ and ſets out in his tranſlation of it, by making Troy *a town*, which in the original is κωμη, a *village*.§ In the next page he calls it *a City* in Arabia, then proves it

NOTES.

* If the Reader wiſhes to know my reaſons for ſuppoſing Strabo never to have been in the Troad, he will find them detailed in the ſecond part of this work.

† The bare name of Troy being found in Egypt, is no more a proof of its not exiſting in Phrygia, than the names of the Egyptian Thebes, and Babylon are of the non-exiſtence of the Bœotian, or Aſſyrian metropolis: But Ilium, Ida, Dardania, Gargara, &c. have unfortunately no duplicates on the Banks of the Nile.

‡ Strabo l. xvii. p. 1162. Strabo, however, found neither Ilium nor Ida in Egypt.

§ Bryant, page 60.

ſuch

ſuch by a quotation from Stephanus. It may be obſerved that here we have no tranſlation, but in fact the quotation will not bear this conſtruction; the words of it are: "*There is alſo a Troy in Egypt*;"* and ſurely this does not prove either the ſize or nature of the place. In the next page he ſlightly mentions a paſſage of Diodorus concerning it, and then amplifies the power of this imaginary City, by making it the key to Egypt, Eaſtward; and laſtly, aſſerts it to have been the ſame as the fortreſs Babylon, though Strabo, by a miſtake, makes them different; for which contradiction of Strabo he brings no contrary authority, or any one ſemblance of an argument.†

It muſt be obſerved that the object of Mr. Bryant, in this part of his work, was to prove that this Egyptian Troy was too conſiderable to have been founded, as Strabo tells us, by the Trojan captives, who were carried thither by Menelaus, for ſays he, "who can poſſibly believe that a City in Arabia was built, or a colony founded there by Trojan captives?" but if this Troy was only a village, and if there were alſo other inſtances of towns being founded by captives, the objection will be anſwered. Let us turn once more to Diodorus:‡ In the very ſentence before that which Mr. Bryant quotes, we ſhall find the following account of the Egyptian Babylon.§ "Of the Egyptian captives, ſome taken in Babylonia revolted againſt the Government, not being able to bear the hardſhips of the public works. Theſe ſeizing on a fortified caſtle near

NOTES.

* Εσι κὴ της Αιγυπτυ Τροια. See BRYANT, p. 61—2.

† Bryant, page 62—3.——‡ Diodorus Seculus, l. i. page 52.

§ Babylon was found in Egypt, the Aſiatic Babylon is now as much obliterated as the Aſiatic Troy; was it therefore equally a fiction? if Mr. Bryant is conſiſtent he muſt think it ſo.

the

the river, made war on the Egyptians, and laid waſte the adjoining country, but at laſt an amneſty being granted them, they coloniſed that place which from their native country they have called Babylon." From a ſimilar cauſe, they ſay, that Troy which ſtill exiſts near the Nile, received its name. For Menelaus returning from Ilium with many captives was driven to Egypt. Here the Trojans revolting from them, ſeized a certain poſt and combated until their ſecurity being eſtabliſhed, they founded a town to which they gave the name of their native city. We ſee then from this curious account that Diodorus every where confirms the teſtimony of Strabo, that Babylon was by no means the ſame city as Troy, and that it is itſelf an inſtance of a conſiderable place founded under the very ſame circumſtances. Were there no other towns founded by fugitives? and were Carthage and Magna Græcia, Ionia, Æolia, and Doris, equally the offspring of fable? Certainly, they whoſe attachment to a ſyſtem is not ſtrong enough to make them ſet aſide poſitive facts, muſt acknowledge that Strabo's ſtory is at leaſt more likely than Mr. Bryant's, as it is ſupported by the concurrent teſtimony of other reſpectable writers. The whole amounts then to no more than this, in Strabo's time there was a village called Troy in Egypt, which Diodorus ſuppoſed to have been formerly more conſiderable, and which both of them agree was built by the Trojan captives, carried thither by Menelaus. The exiſtence of this village, furniſhes Mr. Bryant with another curious conjecture in ſupport of his hypotheſis.

A conjecture of Mr. BRYANT's unſupported either by argument or authority, conſidered.

* There had been, Mr. Bryant "imagines,†" in ancient times

NOTES.

* Concerning a war of Troy in Egypt and of Memnon the Æthiopian. Bryant, p. 62.

† Bryant, p. 62. The word, "imagine," is Mr. Bryant's own; what a weak baſis is imagination for ſo bold and lofty a ſuperſtructure?

ſome great war in Egypt and a powerful conteſt about this *particular place.* As far as this conjecture reſts on the antiquity and ſtrength of this Egyptian fortreſs, it is partly anſwered in the laſt chapter; but Memnon, the Æthiopian, came as an auxiliary to Troy, and his introduction, which is extraordinary if we place the theatre of the war in Phrygia, is conſiſtent with probability if we place it in Egypt. The upper regions of Egypt, Mr. Bryant obſerves, were particularly called Æthiopia. There were however ſeveral other nations called Æthiopians, of which he enumerates four, and of which a very detailed account may be found in Diodorus. Homer deſcribes them as inhabiting the extremities both of the Eaſtern and Weſtern world; and Diodorus will enable us to aſcertain from which of theſe Memnon came, who he was ſuppoſed to be, and what were his connexions with Troy. "Tithonus, the brother of Priam, proceeded with an army Eaſtward, through Aſia, as far as Æthiopia, from whence aroſe the ſtory of Memnon, his ſon, being born of Aurora, who was afterwards killed by Achilles, when he was ſerving as an auxiliary to the Trojans."* Now it will be obſerved that Memnon, the Son of the Morning, came from the provinces of Eaſtern Aſia; a reſidence much more ſuited to the morning than the Southern ſands of Upper Egypt. His connexion with Troy in Phrygia is accounted for, ſince he was the ſon of Tithonus, poſſibly by an Æthiopian mother; but it will be more difficult for Mr. Bryant to render this ſtory conſiſtent with the idea of a war in Egypt, ſince that country is full as far removed as Phrygia from the Eaſtern reſidence of Memnon and Tithonus; and it is much eaſier to imagine that Memnon

NOTE.

* Diodorus. B. iv. p. 319.

came

came from the Eaſt to Troy, a nephew, and auxiliary to Priam, than to refer him, together with all the other heroes of Greece and Aſia to the diſtant ſcene where Mr. Bryant conjectures the ſtory to have originated. If we cannot ſuppoſe that Memnon travelled from Æthiopia into Phrygia, can we believe that the reſt of the Trojan auxiliaries travelled from Aſia into Egypt? but if Mr. Bryant denies the fact, and attributes the whole of the ſtory to Homer's imagination, he muſt allow that this circumſtance of Memnon may be equally imaginary, and in that caſe the reſt of the ſtory is conſiſtent even according to his ideas; but the tradition relative to Tithonus which I have quoted from Diodorus, ſhews that the ſtory did not wholly reſt on Homer's authority, and vindicates him from the charge of inconſiſtency in relating what was probably the popular ſtory of theſe early ages.

Extreme uncertainty concerning both the æra and birth place of Homer.

In the next chapter * Mr. Bryant ſets out by recapitulating ſome arguments which we have already treated of, particularly that there were traditions and writings concerning a Trojan war previous to the Iliad and Odyſſey. He obſerves that writers differ greatly about the time of Homer's birth, and he is therefore inclined to ſuppoſe that he is by no means of that antiquity to which he has been generally raiſed. Writers who have ſtated the ſuppoſed æra of Troy, introduce him afterwards at various intervals, according to their caprice, or their imperfect information; thus ſome ſtate this interval to have been no more than eighty years, whilſt ſome advance it to five hundred. Writers differ therefore extremely about the time of Homer, and no leſs about the place

NOTE.

* Ancient traditions concerning a war of Troy. Bryant, p. 64.

of

of his nativity. I muſt however obſerve that this extreme uncertainty about the æra of Homer entirely deſtroys the poſſibility of proving what writers did really treat of this ſubject before him, ſince it is not at all known when he exiſted. It is fortunate that his poems having come down to us, we are in poſſeſſion of proofs that he really did exiſt, ſince otherwiſe the inconſiſtency of the ſtories related of him, would in all probability have induced Mr. Bryant by a ſimilarity of reaſoning to perſuade us that the Poet as well as his Troy was a fiction of the ancients.

Enumeration of the authors who preceded Homer, conſidered.

Mr. Bryant however inſiſts farther, that at whatever time Homer lived there were perſons before him who had written upon the ſame ſubject. He once more mentions Daphne of Thebes, ſtiled the Sibyl, and Phantaſia of Memphis. But Daphne was of Thebes in Bœotia, and did not write at all on this ſubject. Diodorus who is the only author that mentions her, and from whom Mr. Bryant quotes, informs us that ſhe verſified the Oracles at Delphos, with wonderful genius, and * that from her, Homer borrowed many verſes to adorn his works. A poet may borrow words and verſes, and by no means write upon the ſame ſubject as the poet whom he plunders, neither can we eaſily ſuppoſe the verſified reſponſes of the Pythian Apollo to have been the groundwork of Homer's Epic ſtory. This lady then was neither an Egyptian nor an Epic poeteſs.—Phantaſia of Memphis, appears from her name to have had but little pretenſions to Egyptian extraction, and ſhe wrote concerning a war of Ilium and an Odyſſea when certainly neither

NOTE.

* This account of Daphne and Phantaſia is mere repetition, (ſee page 33.) but the tautology is not to be aſcribed to me. Where the ſame arguments are twice brought forward, the ſame anſwer is twice required.

Ilium nor Odyſſeus, (Ulyſſes) were transferable to Egypt. The other writers on the Ilian war, prior to Homer, were Siſyphus Cous, an author mentioned by Ttzetzes and Johan. Malala; Syagrius mentioned by Ælian,* and a woman called Helena, mentioned by Ptolomy Hephæſtion as quoted by Photius. The very exiſtence of theſe writers is extremely dubious, we know neither the time in which they wrote, nor the part of Greece in which they lived; how then are we to determine their priority to Homer? Are † Ælian, Ptolomy, and Photius, to decide a queſtion that carries us back to high antiquity by their unſupported aſſertion? But what uſe will Mr. Bryant make of this, even if we grant his argument? Did any of theſe Authors mention a war of Troy in Egypt? Or has any one of the critics and grammarians through whoſe obſcure pages their names and ſcraps have been transfuſed, informed us they had done ſo? No; if they wrote at all, their writings confirm and accord with Homer, at leaſt ſo we muſt continue to believe, till Mr. Bryant, from his copious fund of recondite literature, ſhall produce a paſſage from at leaſt one ancient author, which points Egypt out as the theatre of the Trojan war.

Till then we muſt ſuppoſe that the Grecian authors, prior to Homer, wrote upon a Grecian ſtory, and what is ſtill more extra- Abſurdity ariſing from Mr. BRYANT's ſuppoſition.

NOTES.

* The words of Ælian concerning this Syagrius are ὃς λέγεται τὸν τρῶικον πόλεμον πρῶτος ᾆσαι, and Mr. Bryant by writing ὅς πρῶτος τὸν τρῶικον ἦσε πόλεμον, makes Ælian reſponſible for an aſſertion, which the author himſelf only mentions as a prevalent tradition. The reader will have already found ſpecimens in Mr. Bryant of this mode of quoting which I am ſorry to obſerve is extremely unfair.

† If we allow the exiſtence of theſe writers, Homer will ſtand upon very high authority, they were more ancient than him, and filled up by authentic records the interval of time between the events of the Iliad and his work.

ordinary, that Phantaſia of Memphis celebrated the war of Ilium and the wanderings of Odyſſeus; an abſurdity, which, ſo far from being removed by transferring the ſtory to Egypt, will be made ten times ſtronger, as in that caſe Syagrius, Siſyphus, Helen, and Homer, were juſt as abſurdly employed in celebrating a tranſaction totally foreign to their country. Therefore aſſuming the antiquity and the real exiſtence of all theſe authors, the ſtory of the Phrygian war acquires a ſtronger degree of authority: Theſe writers afford a teſtimony ſtill ſtronger than that of Homer, as being more ancient, and ſince they coincide with him. I leave it to the reader to draw the inference.

Homer, neither the Inventor, nor the Tranſcriber of a falſehood.

Mr. Bryant now ſays, "that *Homer borrowed his account is manifeſt, though it is not ſo clear to whom he was indebted for it." While I contend for the hiſtorical truth of the ſtory, it is very far from my purpoſe to prove that he invented it. Many of the accounts tranſmitted differ widely from Homer; to the liſt Mr. Bryant gives, one ſtill more numerous might be added; we might quote from † Herodotus the traditions of Aſia concerning Troy as well as thoſe of Egypt, and I would then call upon Mr. Bryant even from the traditions of his favourite country, to bring one paſſage out of all this contradictory evidence which tends to remove Ilium out of Phrygia, or to make the Troja of Egypt the Ilium of Homer.‡ What then is the inference which common-ſenſe points out to us; that the articles in which theſe variable teſtimonies

NOTES.

* Concerning the different accounts tranſmitted. Bryant, p. 66.

† Herodotus, l. i. p. 3.

‡ As the inference here drawn from the inconſiſtency of the ancient accounts is in effect the ſame which I deduce from the accurate and uniform conſiſtency of Homer, I may appear to draw the ſame concluſion from contrary premiſes. To obviate ſuch an objection I will remind the reader that

teſtimonies agree are indiſputable facts, whilſt thoſe in which they differ are the ſtrongeſt proofs, that inſtead of tranſcribing from one another, their authors conſulted the imperfect though deciſive teſtimony of general tradition. As Mr. Bryant himſelf has made uſe of this very mode of reaſoning to prove the Moſaic account of the Deluge, and as he has diſplayed the greateſt ingenuity in tracing that fact through the different traditions of different nations, how can he reſiſt this inference? The accounts of the Trojan war are ſurely not more various than the accounts of the flood; in both caſes their variety proves their generality and their generality proves their truth.

Let us however conſider who are the authors on whoſe contradictions he lays ſo great a ſtreſs. Different anecdotes concerning Achilles and Iphigenia are differently related by Euſebius (apud Scaligerum); Ptolemy Heph. apud Photium; Scholia of Apollonius, Philoſtratus, Tzetzes, Antoninus Liberalis, Hyginus, and the poetical writers Lucretius, Propertius, Euripides and Ovid. Obſcurity, comparative modernism or poetical licence form the characteriſtics of the whole liſt. The common tradition, or rather the tradition which has become common, ſince Virgil and *Ovid adopted it in their writ-

NOTES.

that the inconſiſtency of an author with himſelf does invalidate the whole of his teſtimony, but that the variations which always take place when two people relate the ſame ſtory, have directly the contrary effect, as it ſhews the ſources of each to have been different though concurrent in their general tenor, and therefore implies a more extenſive belief of the fact than if they could be ſuppoſed to have copied from one another. This mode of arguing is directly the reverſe of Mr. Bryant's, who contends that theſe inconſiſtent traditions deſtroy their own credibility, and that the conſiſtency of Homer is a proof of his falſehood.

* I am aware that the death of Aſtyanax is mentioned prior to this by Euripides. Whatever was his fate, however, it is not celebrated by Homer; who only names the poſterity of Æneas as ſucceeding to the government. His ſtory then is uncontradicted by the early writers, and confirmed by the tradition of the Scepſians.—Eurip. Troad.

ings,

ings, aſſerts that Aſtyanax was killed in Troy, and that Aſcanius fled with his father to Italy. But there were writers who affirmed that this account was by no means true. Strabo* ſeems to have obtained a tradition from the people of Scepſis deriving their origin from theſe very perſons, whoſe poſterity are ſaid to have reigned there a long time; and this is favoured by the evidence of Homer, who ſays that the family of Æneas ſhould ſucceed to the rule over the Trojans. Why then, ſays Mr. Bryant, ſhould not this ſtory be as true as any other? Why indeed? But ſince it bears every mark of authenticity, ſince the Scepſians had ſuch a tradition and lived ſo near the ſpot, ſince Homer's prophecy can only be conſidered as the record of what happened after the fall of Ilium their coincidence is of the greateſt conſequence. It illuſtrates and confirms the account of Homer, and puts Mr. Bryant under the diſagreeable neceſſity of transferring not only Troy, but Scepſis, Cebrenia, and Ida, to the borders of the Nile.† There was alſo a town in the diſtrict of Scepſis which bore the name of Æneas; the town exiſts to this day and retains the name Æné. Every circumſtance then in this ſtory whilſt it confutes the ornamented relations of ſubſequent writers, corroborates the ſimple tale of Homer, whoſe unembelliſhed account, independent of ſuch corroboration, bears the ſtrongeſt internal marks of hiſtorical veracity.

But according to Mr. Bryant many of theſe variations in the ſtory exiſted before the time of Homer, ſince in his opinion his excellence was ſuch as to preclude any ſubſequent deviations. That there were traditions coeval with Homer, and

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. xiii. p. 607.—Homer, Il. xx. ver. 306.

† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 603.

poſſibly

poſſibly differing from him, is more than probable; yet, even allowing the fact, I do not perceive what inference can be drawn from it in favour of Mr. Bryant, as theſe varying traditions do not any where appear to have removed Ilium in Phrygia to Troy in Egypt, or to have ever differed from Homer in the eſſential outline of his ſtory. I own however I am inclined to aſcribe many of the wonderful ſtories we read on this ſubject to the fertile imagination of after-ages, and the emulative ſpirit of fiction with which Homer's fame inſpired the later poets. But Mr. Bryant attributes this inconſiſtency to the difference of the times at which the accounts were brought over from Egypt, and their being adopted in various parts of the world. The Greeks he ſuppoſes ſubſtituted Greek names for Egyptian ones, or at leaſt hellenized them according to their own taſte. Does this account for the inconſiſtency obſerved? * and if I ſhould allow it to be a difficulty, ſtill will Mr. Bryant ſay that his ſyſtem removes it? Upon this ſuppoſition we ſee colonies from Egypt bringing over at different times contradictory traditions relative to a war in Egypt, theſe traditions aſſume in Greece a new form, are adorned with Grecian names, are adapted by piecemeal to a real ſcene in Phrygia in the plain of Ilium, and Ilium is new-named Troy, from a Troy in Egypt to which every one of theſe ſtories ſhould again be referred. It is extremely ſingular that not one of theſe traditions, however contradictory, ſhould be adapted to any other country but Phrygia, and I would aſk how this ſtory was ſo intimately analogous to Ilium in Phrygia, as to be uniformly referred to that

NOTE.

* I would have it underſtood that this conceſſion is only made to ſhew the weakneſs of Mr. Bryant's argument on his own ſuppoſition, ſince I by no means allow that ſuch inconſiſtency invalidates the different narrations. On the contrary it is the ſtrongeſt proof of their truth when they agree. (See note on p. 42.)

ſpot only, if it really belonged to another? Theſe are arguments which every reader will ſuggeſt to himſelf ſo immediately, that I wiſh only to point them out and will not waſte his patience by commenting on them.

Inferences from ſuch premiſes invalidated by the refutation of thoſe premiſes.

The * inferences are ſuch as his foregoing arguments were intended to prove; that the ſtory of Troy was foreign to Greece, and imported from Egypt. Having ſo much invalidated the premiſes, I can hardly join in the concluſion. A further argument which he places here is this—"No genuine hiſtory of any country was ever rendered ſo inconſiſtent by the natives. Of this there is not one inſtance upon record." Let us read every paſſage relative to the heroic ages of Greece. We ſhall find allegory and fiction perpetually interwoven with truth. Homer alone drew out of obſcurity one bright page of their venerable annals, but are we therefore to ſuppoſe that all the other names celebrated by poets and hiſtorians as the founders or protectors of the Grecian ſtates, were foreign to Greece becauſe their ſtories are not accurately conſiſtent. It was not till the time of Herodotus that hiſtory emerged from her night of fable; but ſtill through that gloom we can diſtinctly mark a few great events in which different writers agree. As the ſources from which they draw their information are evidently not the ſame, their traditional inconſiſtencies prove the general facts.

Cauſes of obſcurity in the early parts of Grecian hiſtory, conſidered.

Mr. Bryant then hints at the improbability of the Phrygians, (whom he conſiders as a totally diſtinct race from the Greeks) having names that ſeem to be derived from a Grecian origin. For the preſent, however, he diſmiſſes this ſubject, and as he recurs to it with more detail in the ſubſequent chapters,

NOTE.

* Inferences made from the ancient accounts.

we

we will there conſider this objection in its fulleſt extent. In the mean-time he objects that Homer ſeems not to have been intimately acquainted with Phrygia, ſince the deities he there introduces are not of Aſiatic origin, and the gods of Greece are by him ſubſtituted in their room. Before we ſubſcribe implicitly to Mr. Bryant's aſſertion, let us conſider the very different language of his earlier works. In the Analyſis of Ancient Mythology, we read that, "On * the diſperſion of the Cuthites, the Meropes came "into Greece; all the Helladians, as well as Ionians, were Mero-"pians. The Trojans alſo were of this race, and the Poet ſpeak-"ing of the foundation of Troy, mentions it as a City of Meropians, "πολις μεροπων ανθρωπων, founded by Dardanus. The Dardani were "Atlantians, being reputed children of Electra. The Trojans and "Myſians were of a different race from the native Phrygians, "being of the ſame language with the people of Hellas and Ionia. "The Phrygians were deſcendants of Japhet and Javan, and poſ-"ſeſſed the whole country except ſome diſtricts on the ſea coaſt. "As they were of a different race, ſo they had a different language "from the Trojans; but the Grecians and Trojans were of the "ſame family, and are introduced as ſpeaking the ſame language."

Thus far Mr. Bryant.—"*O ſi ſic omnia.*"—Who were the Trojans of whom he here ſpeaks? Certainly not the inhabitants of a village in Egypt; but a Phrygian nation, of the ſame language and origin with the Greeks. Why not therefore of the ſame names and the ſame religion? If Homer then had adopted the religion of Rhea and the names of Phrygia, which differed entirely from

NOTE.

* Meropes, μεροπες, is a common epithet of the Greek writers, and ſo far from deſigning a particular race, is every where applied to mankind in general; but this tranſlation of the πολις μεροπων ανθρωπων, has its etymological uſes in the place where it is applied. Bryant's Analyſis of Ancient Mythology, vol. iii. p. 435.

thoſe

thoſe of Troy and Myſia, he would, according to this ſtatement, have betrayed the groſſeſt ignorance. However it is probable that the Phrygians alſo had a language and a worſhip, in ſome reſpects analogous to thoſe of Greece. On recurring to Strabo we find the following account of them; " the *Phrygians alſo being a colony from Thrace brought over from thence their myſteries." Theſe myſteries, it appears, were the myſteries of Samothrace, in which Rhea, Berecynthia, Attys, and the Dioſcuri, were the principal divinities.† We alſo find afterwards an additional proof of this, for Strabo farther tells us, that there were many Thracian names, common alſo to Troy. The Scæi were a nation in Thrace, they had alſo a river Scæus, and a Scæan wall—ſo in Troy there was a Scæan gate; another Thracian horde were called Xanthii—the river near Troy was Xanthus. The river Ariſbus falls into the Hebrus—Ariſbe is the name of a Trojan town. Rheſus, a Trojan river, is the name of a Thracian King. When Mr. Bryant afterwards converts at one ſweep all the tombs now remaining in Troas into Thracian Barrows, he ſeems to acknowledge this genealogy. Whether the Thracians migrated from Aſia, or the Phrygians from Thrace,

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. x. p. 471.

† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 590. In confirmation of Mr. Bryant's account mentioned from the Analyſis of Ancient Mythology, I will notice ſome of the nations of Aſia, which are given in ancient authors as of European origin. Mela ſays, that of the Carians the origin is uncertain, but " ſunt qui Pelaſgos exiſtimant." l. i. c. 16.—The Ciconians were Thracians from the Banks of the Hebrus. The Pæonians were Macedonians. Strabo, p. 323. (498.)

The Paphlagonians were a colony ſent from Arcadia, led by a ſon of Phineus, King of that Country. Statii Theb. viii. 255. Valer. Flacc. iv. 444. In Macedonia from the earlieſt times we find the names of Alexandros and Philippos, a ſure proof either that the language was Greek or their names hellenized by Greek writers; their Kings claimed their deſcent from Hercules. Di onys. Halicarnaſs. declares that Troy had a Greek original, p. 27, and 49. The Pelaſgi were Arcadians; at leaſt ſome of them were. Strabo, p. 230, and 620.—They coloniſed Leſbos and Imbros. Herodot. Terpſich. c. 26.

is of little conſequence, they had the ſame language and religion. What theſe were in Thrace, the fragments of the Thracian Orpheus, Muſæus, and Thamyris will ſufficiently evince. But theſe fragments it will be ſaid are not authentic; perhaps they are not, but they are of ſuch an antiquity that the forgery will equally prove the aſſertion. If Chatterton had diſcovered Rowley in French, there would have been but little room for controverſy. In the liſt I have juſt given, Xanthus and Xanthios are undoubtedly names of Greek derivation, therefore all the coloniſts of this part of the world ſeem derived from a common ſtock. That Rhea and the other myſtic gods were the deities of Thrace, there is no doubt, from the paſſages I have quoted, yet we find the * Muſes, Libethrides, Bacchus, and more particularly Mars, perfectly naturaliſed amongſt them. The Grecian gods were not therefore introduced here by Homer; but the two nations had an analogous religion. It is true, however, that Homer in the Iliad, "takes no notice of Rhea, Dindymene, Berecynthia, the great mother of the gods, the mighty mother;" But in the nature of theſe myſteries we ſhall find the reaſon of it. This whole worſhip was myſtic, and totally apart, like that at Eleuſis, from the every day religion of the uninitiated. The προεδροι or aſſeſſors of Rhea, who were joined in worſhip with her are ſcarcely known by name; even her prieſts were wrapt in obſcurity; the Cabiri, the Curetes, and the Corybantes are names which Strabo and Diodorus in vain attempt to define. The deities of the Synod were ſo ſacred, that their very names were

NOTE.

* Strabo, l. x. p. 471. "On Thracia's hills the Lord of war
"Has curbed the fury of his car." GRAY.

myſtic. Τὰ δε ὀνοματτα ἀυτῶν ἔσι μυσικά.* Such were the myſteries of Samothrace, or rather ſuch is all we know of them. Like thoſe of Eleuſis they did not furniſh out any epic machinery to the poets of Paganiſm, for it was ſacrilege to divulge the ſecrets of their worſhip. Homer, therefore, has recourſe to the received religion of the country, perhaps of his own country more particularly; but it will be remembered that the Greeks and Romans found their own gods in every country they invaded: Reſemblance of attributes alone identified the Ζευς, Jupiter, and the German Taranis; Αθηνη, Pallas, and Minerva; Δημητηρ and Ceres; Αιδωνευς and Pluto; Ἡφαιστος, Vulcan and Mulciber; Αρτεμις, Diana, and Britomartis; Αφροδιτη, Venus, Mylitta, Alitta, and Metra; and a thouſand others.‡ Be therefore the local names of Phrygian gods what they might, a Greek writing to Greeks would adopt the names by which they were worſhipped in his own country. But Berecynthia does not preclude Jupiter and her other children, ſince ſhe was the mother of all the gods who are mentioned; her own character however would not have ſuited well with a field of battle. For the ſame reaſon perhaps Homer no where mentions Ceres, who was likewiſe a myſtic deity. We find alſo that though theſe myſteries were principally obſerved in Samothrace and Phrygia, yet many nations of the Greeks participated in their celebration. Thus we find the Curetes in Acarnania, Ætolia, and Crete; the Cabiri in Lemnos and Imbrus; † and the Greeks with many of the barbarous nations, ſent proceſſions (πομπαι) thither in the ſame manner as to Delos. It ſeems therefore probable from theſe circumſtances, that the religion

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. x. p. 473. Virg. Æn. l. v. 784.

† Strabo l. x. p. 471, and ſeq.

‡ See Vincent's Voyage of Nearchus, p. 477, the note.

of

of Phrygia was received in Greece, and it is equally probable that the gods of Greece were to be found in Phrygia.

Phrygian claims to high antiquity conſidered.

The Phrygians, it is ſaid, laid claim to *high antiquity*, they vied with the Egyptians who allowed their priority; this is told us, ſays Mr. Bryant, by Herodotus, who alſo admits their precedence. I will tranſlate the paſſage referred to. "The * Egyptians, before the reign of Pſammetichus, eſteemed themſelves the moſt ancient race of human kind; but Pſammetichus being King, wiſhed to ſatisfy himſelf who had really the beſt claim to antiquity, and ſince that time they have looked upon the Phrygians as prior to themſelves, but they rank themſelves before all other nations. For Pſammetichus being long unable to invent any way of aſcertaining what race of men were really the oldeſt, thought at length of the following expedient: He gave two children, newly born of poor parents, to a ſhepherd, ordering him to breed them with his flock, and never to utter any ſound of voice before them, but keep them apart in an empty ſhed; to bring them ſhe goats to nurſe them at ſtated times, and when they left off milk to give them ſuch food as might then be proper. This Pſammetichus did, deſiring to hear what diſtinct word would firſt be ſpoken by them, after they had grown to the age when they would leave off their inarticulate wailings; and the event alſo anſwered his expectation; for, when they were now two years old, both the children, tottering forward when the ſhepherd opened the door and was coming in to them, cryed out *Beccos* and ſtretched out their hands. The ſhepherd at firſt ſaid nothing of what he had heard; but the ſame word being conſtantly repeated whenever he attended them, he mentioned it

NOTE.

* Herodotus l. ii. c. 2.

to

to his maſter, who ordered him to bring the children before him. Pſammetichus hearing this himſelf, aſked what nation called any thing by the name of *Beccos*, and found upon inquiry that it was the Phrygian name for bread. In conſideration of this circumſtance, therefore, the Egyptians acknowledge the Phrygians to be a more ancient race; theſe facts I heard from the prieſts of Vulcan at Memphis." This is all that Herodotus ſays on the ſubject, and the reader might wiſh in vain for clearer proof of the antiquity of Phrygia.

The name and language of Greece not improbably introduced into Aſia before Homer.

But amidſt all this confuſion and intermixture of nations, a very conſiderable claſs of them is acknowledged by Mr. Bryant * himſelf, as being of Grecian race. Their names therefore were not introduced into Phrygia by Homer. Of theſe Mr. Bryant himſelf reckons the Trojans, Myſians, and other inhabitants of the coaſt. All arguments drawn from their names are therefore anſwered by his own conceſſion. Had Homer indeed given them other denominations we ſhould then have been juſtified in drawing the ſame concluſion with Mr. Bryant. But the Phrygians are ſometimes mentioned as ſeparate from the Trojans: in the catalogue of the Trojan allies † they are led from the diſtant Aſcania by Phorcys and Aſcanius, whoſe names are not derived from Greek, and we learn that ſome of the Phrygians ſpoke a different language. A great many of the Trojan names have obviouſly roots foreign to Greece. Priam, Æneas, Anchiſes, we in vain ſeek for in that language; but it is true that declinable terminations, according

NOTES.

* See Analyſis of Ancient Mythology in the place above cited. Vol. iii, p. 435. And alſo of the Pelaſgi, Caucones, and Leleges. Vol. iii, 385.

† Bryant l. ii. p. 862.

to

to the genius of the Greek language, are uniformly added; this is not only excuſable, but neceſſary in a Grecian, whoſe language depended on its powers of inflexion; and we find it practiſed by every hiſtorian of antiquity.* The names of Perſian kings are hellenized in Herodotus, as much as thoſe of the Aſiatic heroes are in Homer. As the Carians were βαρβαροφωνοι or of a barbarous language, a reaſon is contained in the very epithet for declining to uſe ſome at leaſt of their native names; Greek verſions of the ſame import, and certainly Greek terminations would be ſubſtituted for them. Thus it is clear that Amphimachus was a Greek name, but Naſtes, the other leader, appears to have retained his original appellation, made capable of a Greek inflexion. How can Mr. Bryant ſay that Homer gave to theſe nations on the coaſt of Aſia the names that they bore after the Grecians had coloniſed the †coaſt, when he himſelf tells us in another place, that at a period long before this *ſecond* Ionian migration, the people of Troy, Myſia, Ionia, and Hellas, were of the ſame family? Whether, by Meropes was formerly underſtood a particular race or not; and however others may doubt his inge-

NOTES.

* Terminations of this ſort are conſtantly made uſe of in Greek, even where poetical motives do not require them. The Mithridath, Rehum, Shimſhai, Tabeel, and Biſhlam of the Canonical Ezra, appear in the Apocryphal Eſdras under the names of Mithridates, Rathumos, Semellios, Tabellios, and Belemos. See Ezra, iv. 7, 8, and 1 Eſdras, ii. 11. xvi. 30. Are not theſe names as apparently Grecian as moſt of thoſe recorded in Homer's catalogue? The radicals of Achilleus, Aias, Odyſſeus, Idomeneus, Merion, and a hundred others, are juſt as much loſt as thoſe of Priam, Æneas, Anchiſes, &c. The names of many places alſo, as Kiſſos, Erymanthos, Pholoe, Corinthos, &c. &c. are not now to be traced to any root in Greek, are they therefore not Grecian? and when we are in the ſame ignorance with regard to many of the other names, becauſe we know not the radicals of the Aſiatic language, are we to conclude that they were not Aſiatic, nay more, that they were Greek, becauſe Homer and his countrymen had hellenized them?

† In the places above cited. Vol. iii. p. 385, 435, and other places in the third vol.

nious conjectures on this part of ancient mythology, ſtill againſt him the argument is concluſive. Inſtead therefore of cavilling at the Greek appellatives, if Mr. Bryant had taken them to pieces with half his uſual etymological talents, I have no doubt but he could have traced them back to any one language he had been pleaſed to aſſign.

Homer's general conſiſtency the proof of his truth not of his ingenuity.

" Homer," ſays Mr. * Bryant, " was engaged in a period of obſcurity, and being to adapt his hiſtory to another age and a different race of men, he was obliged to render it conſiſtent with the traditions of the people for whom he wrote." Conſiſtency is not a fault in any hiſtory, certainly, and whether the hiſtory was naturally conſiſtent, or made ſo by Homer's judgment, it can hardly be brought forward as a proof of its falſehood. " But he has invented names and characters ; and made them plauſible by anecdotes and genealogies." So plauſible indeed, that the nations of Greece and Troy quoted theſe genealogies as their titles of deſcent ; ſo plauſible that Pericles claimed his deſcent from Neſtor, and was believed at the moſt learned period of his learned country. If then ſuch names were given as might have exiſted, and anecdotes and genealogies recorded which might have taken place, who ſhall contradict Homer and argue from the probability of a fact's being true, that therefore it was falſe, and the ſtory adapted to the occaſion ? Is this logical ? and would Mr. Bryant allow the inference on any other ſubject ?

" But moſt of theſe genealogies ended in a god." Of this Mr. Bryant gives many inſtances. He had told us however in the page before that Homer was engaged in a period of

NOTE.

* Further conſiderations concerning names, and likewiſe of families. Bryant, p. 76.

obſcurity,

obſcurity, when letters had juſt been introduced into Greece; yet here he blames him for not poſſeſſing the genealogy of his heroes for more than one or two generations. Really if he had given us more it would be a ſtrong proof of his invention, but a bad argument of his veracity, provided the days were in fact as obſcure as Mr. Bryant himſelf ſuppoſes them. In thoſe times when a man diſtinguiſhed himſelf by an heroic action, he raiſed his family into notice, perhaps into riches and power. The flattering zeal of a grateful people traced back his origin till their brief tradition was loſt in an obſcurity which imagination aſſigned to Beings of ſuperior order. Have we not at this hour, the letter from Olympias to Alexander, gravely aſſuring him that he was not the ſon of Jupiter? If ſuch was the folly of the age, even in the refined days of Alexander, can we be ſurpriſed at the popular ſtories of great men's genealogies, during "a period of obſcurity," in a nation by nature both ſuperſtitious and poetical? A poet naturally availed himſelf of the wild mythology of the times, and peopled his poem with the kindred of his Deities. Such is the conduct of Homer, and ſuch is the conduct of nature. If Homer alone had brought forward the gods ſome doubt might have ariſen, but we find every hero of the times make the ſame claim to a divine original with thoſe of the Poet: which ſhews that theſe celeſtial pedigrees were not peculiar to Homer, and that his cuſtoms and ſtory are only recorded, not invented by him.

Objection founded on the name of Agamemnon conſidered.

To the name and character of Agamemnon, Mr. Bryant next brings forward an objection, which he repeats in a ſubſequent chapter. * It ſeems from Homer, that Agamemnon was com-

NOTE.

* See Bryant. Concerning the heroes who were deified.

mander

mander in chief and king of the "powerful Mycenæ;" but Mr. Bryant ſays, there is no reaſon to think Mycenæ was ever a place of ſuch eminence as Homer makes it. He ſhould have ſhewn, however, that there was ſufficient reaſon to be ſure of the contrary, ſince Homer's evidence is good till contradicted by an evidence equally poſitive and equally authentic. The ſtates of Greece were ſo far from looking upon Homer, as Mr. Bryant does, that we find him quoted by their lawgivers and ambaſſadors to aſcertain differences ariſing from claims of territory. We find in Plutarch, that when the Athenians and Megarenſians made pretenſions to the poſſeſſion of Salamis, the diſpute was referred to Sparta. Before their aſſembly Solon pleaded the rights of his country, and one principal ground of claim were two lines from Homer:

Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας,
Στῆσε δ' ἄγων, ἵν' Ἀθηναίων ἵσαν̓το φάλαγγες.*

This ſtory is confirmed to us by Demoſthenes;† it is alluded to by Ariſtotle, and D. Laertius is alſo another tranſcriber of it. Now if Homer was made an arbiter to decide property in Greece, I ſee no reaſon to doubt his evidence with regard to Mycenæ.

But we find other ancient authors believing and confirming that evidence. Strabo‡ gives us the following account of Argos and Mycenæ. "At firſt," he ſays, "Argos was the moſt powerful, afterwards Mycenæ took the lead, in conſequence of the ſons of Pelops

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. l. ii. v. 557.—† Demoſth. de falſ. legat. p. 332. Ariſtot. Rhetor. l. i. c. ult.

‡ Strabo, l. viii. p. 372.

having

leaving Argos to ſettle there. For all the power devolving on the ſons of Atreus, Agamemnon, the elder, being ſovereign, his good fortune and courage enlarged his dominions, and added Laconia (or as ſome read Argolis) to his kingdom. For his brother, Menelaus held Laconia. Agamemnon commanded, therefore, Mycenæ, the diſtrict as far as Corinth and Sicyon, and the country which was then called Ionia and Ægialia, and which has in later times been called Achaia. But after the death of Agamemnon and the end of the Trojan war, Mycenæ declined, and that chiefly at the return of the Heraclidæ." A ſtill ſtronger evidence is furniſhed in this page by Mr. Bryant himſelf. "Thucydides" (ſays his note) "mentions it as a mean place: Μυκηναι μικρον ην, but ſuppoſes it to have been once of greater repute, for which he gives no reaſon.*" The paſſage in Thucydides is however as follows. "Now becauſe *Mycenæ has been a ſmall place*, or if any other town of thoſe times ſhould ſeem of ſmall importance, let not any one from ſo deceitful a circumſtance conclude that the expedition (to Troy) was leſs than the poets repreſent, or than fame has reported it. For if the city of Lacedæmon ſhould be deſolated, and only the temples and the foundations of their ſtructures ſhould remain, I conceive that in the lapſe of years, it would become very doubtful whether their power had ever equalled their renown. For though they poſſeſs two fifths of the Peloponneſus, and govern the whole of it, and are at the head of a great alliance out of it, yet it is clear that they would ſeem inferior to their fame; ſince the town is neither compactly built, nor adorned with temples and magnificent edifices; but conſiſts of ſcattered hamlets *after*

NOTE.

* Bryant, p. 78.—Thucydides, l. i. c. 10.

the early mode of Greece. But if the ſame deſolation ſhould happen to Athens, the power of that City would be thought by poſterity to have doubled that which it really poſſeſſes. Let us not therefore doubt theſe hiſtories, and eſtimate the appearance rather than the ſtrength of ancient towns." This is at full length the paſſage, a part of which Mr. Bryant has quoted. If Homer's ſtory was plauſible enough to ſatisfy an hiſtorian ſo ſagacious as Thucydides, and who was well acquainted with the ancient hiſtories of his own country, I take his acquieſcence in the ſuppoſed power of Mycenæ to be an infinitely ſtronger teſtimony than any unſupported aſſertion made after a ſpace of above 2000 years, when all the early hiſtories have periſhed. I have now amply diſcuſſed the ſubject of Mycenæ, with which, if the reader is not ſatisfied, he will find ſtill more in Pauſanias.* When Mr. Bryant aſſerts, therefore, that its primitive ſplendor is to be found only in Homer, he ſhould reflect that Homer is *now* the only authority *we* have of thoſe early times; but that Thucydides mentions *Poets* in the plural number, and alſo *common fame*; ſo that he had concurrent teſtimonies, and we have ſeen the reſult of his inquiries in the paſſage above quoted. "But the wide rule given to it is contradicted "by the hiſtories of Corinth and other Cities, as may be inferred "from Plutarch, Strabo, and other writers." The contrary, however, is pretty plainly inferred from the paſſage of Strabo above quoted, and as Mr. Bryant has not produced one line from any of theſe writers, I cannot anſwer the aſſertion better.

Names of the heroes and of Agamemnon particularly, not borrowed from the provincial deities, or if borrowed no proof againſt their exiſtence.

"Homer borrows the names of many of his heroes from "provincial deities, known in his time, from whence many of the

NOTE.

* Pauſan. l. ii. c. 16, 17.

"heroes

" heroes were afterwards ſuppoſed to have their altars; which in " reality were erected to the gods whoſe names they bore." Mr. Bryant elſewhere repeats this argument with more detail; and in its proper place the reader will find it fully, and I hope ſatisfactorily anſwered. He here confines himſelf to the ſingle inſtance of Agamemnon, and tells us that "Lycophron* and Clemens " Alexandrinus mention altars of Ζευς Αγαμεμνων, ſo alſo we find " mentioned in Athenagoras.†" Suppoſing Agamemnon, however, to have been one of the various names or epithets under which Jupiter was honoured, is it not juſt as probable that it ſhould be given to men by the cuſtom of the times, as that Homer, in violation of every cuſtom, ſhould adopt a name which could not be given to men?—"Euſtathius," he proceeds, "quotes alſo two other " titles of Jupiter in this very chapter, ευρυκρειων and ευρυμεδων, having " wide rule and extenſive command." Admitted; but Eurycreon and Eurymedon are both uſed as proper names by the Grecians.‡ In another place Mr. Bryant himſelf tells us that Lycurgus was only a name of the Sun as worſhipped by the Amonites; and yet we repeatedly find the name of Lycurgus applied to men at different

NOTES.

* Mr. Bryant here quotes two verſes from Lycophron very rightly, (Bryant p. 79) but as they are prophetic of the future dignity of the hero, they cannot be conſtrued into a proof that Agamemnon had been previouſly a title of Jupiter; beſides it appears this title was confined to the diſtrict of Sparta. Tzetzes in his comment on this paſſage, ſays, Οι Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἱδρυσαντο Ἀγαμέμνονος Διὸς ἱερον ἐις τιμὴν τῆ Ἡρωος. Canter, Meurſius, and Potter are of the ſame opinion, and are quoted by Mr. Bryant himſelf. V. 335 of Lycophron is of the ſame import, and tends to prove that he conſidered the leader of the Grecian hoſt as the perſon deified under his name.

† The paſſage from Athenagoras has the ſame tendency, however perverted by Mr. Bryant. He is actually ſumming up the names of the heroes and heroines who were afterwards worſhipped. Ὁ μεν Ιλιεὺς Θεον Ἕκτορα λέγει, καὶ Ἡν Ελένην Ἀδράστειαν επισαμένος προσκυνεῖ. ὁ δε Λακεδαιμονιος Ἀγαμέμνονα Δία, καὶ Φυλονόην Ἡν Τυνδάρεω θυγατέρα. κ.τ.λ. σεβει. Now if Agamemnon was a name of Jupiter, and diſtinct from the hero, the introduction of him here is totally foreign to the purpoſe, and the author ſufficiently explains his own meaning by the context.

‡ Bryant's Analy. of Anc. Mythology. L. iii. p. 42.

æras

æras of the Grecian hiſtory. Whether Jupiter therefore had the title of Agamemnon or not, literally proves nothing; an analogous argument would lie againſt every chriſtian name, becauſe the ſame names are enrolled as ſaints in a Romiſh Calendar. Recurring then to his former aſſertion, as if it were a reſulting conſequence, he repeats, that "all Homer's account is ideal. No ſuch dominion as that of Mycenæ exiſted; the ſuppoſition is contrary to all ancient hiſtory."—What hiſtory? Does there exiſt a ſingle proof of this poſition? Has Mr. Bryant produced one?

Agamemnon, Menelaus, &c. not neceſſarily to be traced to the language of Egypt.

It is next aſſerted* that "Agamemnon was an Egyptian compound, and imported into Greece. It related to the god Memnon, and his worſhip was brought to Argos and Lacedæmon, by the Danaidæ and Melampodes from Thebes in Egypt. Aga, we are afterwards told, was an ancient title for a leader, and is often compounded in Greek names as Agenor, Agamedes, Agathyrſus, &c." If Aga then be indeed a common Greek compound, why ſhould Agamemnon be ranked as an ideal being rather than Agamedes or the reſt? As for the Egyptian conjecture, and the inconſequent inference we here ſee deduced from it, I will only obſerve to the reader, that excepting the ſimilarity between the names of Memnon and Agamemnon, there is not the ſhadow of a foundation for it. But if etymology is to be had recourſe to, we have no occaſion to tranſlate Agamemnon into Egypt: The name is applied to an extraordinary hero and to Jupiter. In Greek we find αγαν μιμνων: *valde manens*, *long remaining*, if applied to the Hero of Troy; *immortal*, if applied to the God. This conjecture like the other proves nothing; it is not however without its uſe,

NOTE.

* On the purport of the term Agamemnon. Bryant, p. 81.

it

it may ſerve by an example to convince my reader that etymological proofs may always be brought on both ſides. We are alſo told that Meneſtheus, Petes, and Menelaus, were Egyptian compounds. The two firſt are mentioned in Diodorus, as of Egyptian extraction,* and many of the Greeks, we are informed, did come from Egypt. As for Menelaus, though Menes in Egypt gave his name to a Nome called Men-el-ai, yet it is very poſſible that Greece might call one of her heroes Menelaus; the ſimilarity no more proves the non-exiſtence of the hero than of the nome. †Menelaus, is a Greek compound too, and I have as good a right to a Greek etymology as Mr. Bryant to an Egyptian one. Will Mr. Bryant deduce alſo Meneptolemus, Menedemus, Menecrates, Menecharmes, &c. all from the Egyptian god Menes? The argument therefore either proves nothing, or, what is of no higher logical value, it proves too much.

Another ‡difficulty, which with Mr. Bryant is concluſive againſt the ſtory, is, that all the heroes who are enumerated in the cata-

Catalogue of the Heroes in the ſecond Book of Homer, alluſive only to thoſe who ſurvived at that time.

NOTES.

* Diodorus Sic. l. i. p. 25. Τον γαρ Πετην τον παλαιον Μενεσθεως τα στρατευσαντος εις Τροιαν φανερως Αιγυπτιον υπαρξαντα κ.τ.λ. "That Petes, the father of Meneſtheus, who commanded at Troy, was evidently a native of Egypt," &c. He adds, however, that he obtained the ſovereignty of Athens. "Diodorus, ſays Mr. Bryant, "is certainly in the right; for Petes is an Egyptian word, and Meneſtheus a compound of Menes and Theuth. But if Petes emigrated to Athens, and Meneſtheus commanded at Troy, was it not Troy in Phrygia? In the ſame paſſage we find that Petes was called διφυης *of a double nature*, and fabled to be half a man and half a brute; of which the true reaſon, as aſſigned by Diodorus, was ὁτι δυειν πολιτειων μετασχων, Ελληνικης και βαρβαρου. "Becauſe he was a citizen of two different ſtates, one Grecian and one Barbarian." If Petes, therefore, never left Egypt, and Meneſtheus never ſaw the war of Troy, how is Diodorus in the right? The names of William the Conqueror and all his followers were French, but they have never been denied to exiſt in England.

† Μενος λαου as Meneptolemus from Μενος πτολεμου.

‡ Of the chief heroes in the Grecian army and of their extraordinary preſervation. Bry. p. 83.

logue are by Homer repreſented as alive for the moſt part in the ſequel of the Iliad. They are forty-ſix in number, and their names all recur again; ſuch a preſervation is in Mr. Bryant's opinion impoſſible. How far however is ſuch a ſtricture to affect the veracity of Homer? In the ſecond book we find the Grecian army in the tenth year of the war drawn up in the plain of the Scamander. Homer* invokes the Muſe to enumerate "who were the leaders of the Greeks and the commanders of their forces." Οἵτινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν ἠδ κόιρανοι ἦσαν, "who came" ὑπο Ἴλιον "againſt Troy," *at that time.* He recounts the Dramatis Perſonæ of his own Poem: the leaders who were preſent in the tenth year of the war, during which alone he details the facts that happened. If he mentions Proteſilaus it is becauſe that being the firſt who was killed, and the leader whoſe ſhip was afterwards ſet on fire, his character had become traditionally remarkable in Greece. Philoctetes who was abſent is alſo introduced, as upon him depended the fate of Troy: but Medon is repreſented as leading his troops. And thus in the room of thoſe who were dead they had alſo ſubſtituted others who had taken the command; and theſe together with ſuch chiefs as had ſurvived, are the leaders that are named in the catalogue. This is evident, ſince Palamedes, who had been killed, is no where mentioned; and therefore many names now unknown may be in the ſame manner omitted. Suppoſing 10,000 heroes to have died in the firſt nine years, what had Homer to do with them, where are they? juſt where Mr. Bryant requires them to be, either dead or withdrawn from the war, and conſequently from the catalogue of the troops and the action of the Iliad.

NOTE.

* Homer Il. l. ii.

Another

The name of Proteſilaus no ground of juſt objection to the ſtory related of him.

Another objection hinted at in this chapter, is the name of Proteſilaus, which being given, or at leaſt ſeeming to be given from the event of his death, affords, ſays Mr. Bryant, a ſtrong intimation that the hiſtory is a fable. The word Proteſilaus means "the firſt of the people," as Ageſilaus means the leader of the people. Now as Proteſilaus was not the firſt of the people, and as Ageſilaus was the leader of his, the argument is much ſtronger againſt the Lacedæmonian King than againſt the Trojan warrior. Granting, however, that the name * was given him after the event, is that a proof that the event never happened? Certainly it is rather a confirmation of it, as being given in commemoration of his bravery.

Authorities brought forward by Mr. Bryant, too modern or too ſlight for his purpoſe.

†Having now gone through the different arguments which the nature of the ſtory ſuggeſts to him, Mr. Bryant brings forward the opinions of thoſe writers, who (as he wiſhes us to believe) *have ſupported* or forwarded his favourite hypotheſis. Dion Chryſoſtom, whom he chiefly dwells upon, is the firſt mentioned. But of him hereafter; we have now an earlier authority to diſcuſs. Anaxagoras, the philoſopher, who was born about the 70th Olympiad, reſided during the latter part of his life at Lampſacus, ‡ within 45 miles of Troy or Ilium;

NOTES.

* What will poſterity think of Philip Egalité, ci-devant Duke of Orleans? If they reaſon like Mr. Bryant, they muſt conclude that the name was made in conſequence of his Sans Culotiſm, and therefore that the French Revolution was a fable. "*Dii faciant.*"

† The opinions of ſome learned perſons amongſt the ancients concerning both the city and war of Troy. Bryant, p. 86.

‡ Anaxagoras perhaps thought of Homer as Horace did; and conſidered him as a writer.

"Qui quid ſit pulchrum quid turpe, quid utile quid non,
"Planius ac melius Chryſippo & Crantore dicit."

But though moral or phyſical truths may ſeem to reſult from the Iliad, we have no reaſon to deny the

Ilium ; he firſt was of opinion that the whole poem was an allegory; of this we are informed by Phavorinus, as quoted by Diogenes Laertius. Metrodorus alſo, as we are told by the ſame author, contributed much to this opinion of Anaxagoras, ſince he was alſo the founder of an hypotheſis, that the work of the poet was an allegorical repreſentation of natural hiſtory. Mr. Bryant, therefore, argues that ſince Anaxagoras is ſaid to have been the firſt who ſuggeſted the idea, there were others afterwards ; amongſt theſe were Zeno, a philoſopher mentioned in Athenæus, and Baſil the Great. But it proves more, ſince it proves that there were none before him. Now when the earlieſt authority againſt the exiſtence of Troy can be referred no higher than to the 70th Olympiad,* the firſt Olympiad of Anaxagoras's life, when he could not be a very voluminous writer, we ought to eſtimate his authority rather cautiouſly. The war of Troy is generally ſuppoſed to have happened about the year 1183 A. C. the firſt Olympiad was in the year 776, from hence to the time of Anaxagoras's birth is 280 years more; this then forms an interval of no leſs than 687 years. Now as he was the firſt who doubted the ſtory, this diſtance of time

NOTES.

the truth of the narrative that conveys them. Even where allegory is the avowed object of a poem, hiſtorical facts have been made the means of preſenting it. Spencer's Legend of Temperance, like all his other Legends contains a clear and palpable moral allegory, but it alſo contains an hiſtorical one, and repreſents the ſtate of Ireland, under the adminiſtration of Lord Grey, and the rebellion of Lord Deſmond. Now, I would aſk whether even in this caſe the former allegory is deſtructive of the latter? So far from it, that they are both perfected. Hiſtory herſelf moralizes, and all her leſſons are *περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ δικαιοσύνης.*

* When Mr. Bryant gives us the date of Anaxagoras's birth, he would have done well to have added that he lived to a conſiderable old age, and that if ever he reſided at Lampſacus, it was not till very late in life, and after the condemnation for impiety, which was paſſed on him at Athens, had obliged him to leave that city. According to ſome Authors he never left it, but died there by a ſuicide.—See Diogen. Laert. l. 2 Segm. 13. He wrote therefore about Troy much later than the 70th Olympiad, and perhaps never was there at all.

ſhould

ſhould make us very cautious in truſting implicitly to his opinion. We ſhould conſider alſo what character he had as a judge, before we pay deference to his unſupported authority. It is curious to obſerve, that in the very next ſentence we find him recorded as believing that the Heavens were an arch of ſtone ;* becauſe one ſtone was ſaid to have fallen from the air. If his concluſions were frequently ſuch as this, we may doubt whether the premiſes would warrant them. Of Metrodorus we know nothing, but both he and Anaxagoras had this ſimilarity with Mr. Bryant ; they not only pulled down the received ſyſtem, but built up another. Now they ſuppoſe the whole ſtory allegorical, the firſt making it ſymbolical of virtue and vice, the other of natural philoſophy. Each of theſe three ſceptics are therefore contradicted by the other two, and notwithſtanding this contradiction they uſe each others authority as far as it coincides with their own; their miſtakes however in converting Homer into allegory are too apparent to be dwelt upon, and from thence we may learn how far the vanity of ſophiſtry might carry them in ſupport of a ſingular hypotheſis. But ſays Mr. Bryant they lived in Phrygia, in or near the part called Troas. The coaſt *muſt* have been known to them, they were men of knowledge who would *hardly* omit an opportunity of information. Theſe words, qualified as they are with *muſt* and *hardly*, ſhew that all this is conjecture. A man of knowledge would *hardly* believe ſtones fell from heaven, but we find that Anaxagoras did believe it, ſo that it is poſſible theſe men of knowledge and curioſity might not do all that Mr. Bryant aſcribes to them.

NOTE.

* He is alſo recorded, as maintaining the Sun to be a red hot iron, larger than the Peloponneſus. μύδριον διάπυρον καὶ μείζω τῆς Πελοποννήσου. Diog. l. ii. ſec. 8.

Neither was the ſcene of action ſo immediately in their neighbourhood. From Lampſacus to Troy, was 45 miles, to the coaſt ſtill farther. The not finding traces of the city * or country round it, is aſſigned by Mr. Bryant as the motive of their ſcepticiſm; but this motive is no where aſcribed to them by their biographers and diſciples; and Mr. Bryant is himſelf an inſtance of the contrary, for his diſbelief is very far from being founded on an accurate knowledge of the plain. Had the hypotheſis been well founded it would have had more weight at a time when the facts were ſo eaſily aſcertained; but Homer's ſtory ſurvived, and the war was believed; whilſt Metrodorus and Anaxagoras have been conſigned to that oblivion from which Mr. Bryant has raked their memories. "Thus the moſt ancient writers" (ſcil. Metrodorus and Anaxagoras) "either deny," ſays he, "the principal events of the war or totally "reject it." Were they the moſt ancient, and does his chronology inform him of no writers whoſe births were prior to the ſeventieth Olympiad? If he will conſult his Æſchylus, whoſe antiquity is at leaſt ſome few years higher; that author would ſhow him how common the different † traditions were in his time, and how coincident with the ſtory of Troy was the private hiſtory of Greece.

NOTES.

* See note on page 64. It appears very uncertain whether Anaxagoras ever lived at Lampſacus; and at all events as he only lived there the latter part of his life, which was a long one, the Book he wrote if not compoſed before he ſaw the plain, was much later than the 70th Olympiad in which he was born.

† Æſchylus was born 525 years A. C. died 456, aged 69.
Herodotus was born 484 years A. C. died 413, aged 71.
Anaxagoras was born 498 years A. C. died 428, aged 70.
Sophocles was born 496 years A. C. died 406, aged 90.

We ſee therefore that Æſchylus was prior to Anaxagoras, and that Herodotus and Sophocles, who were contemporaries, may be conſidered as older authors, ſince they wrote at an earlier period of life.

Agamemnon,

— Agamemnon, the Choephoræ, and the Furies are all inſtances of it. Sophocles, with every poet of the time, alludes to the hiſtories of this period. Herodotus, the father of hiſtory; Thucydides the moſt accurate of hiſtorians, both give it a formal ſanction. But as Herodotus is brought forward in evidence againſt me, I will beg the reader to attend particularly to Mr. Bryant's argument here, and to conſult with the original, which I believe will not be found very favourable to his hypotheſis. Herodotus was of opinion that the expedition had taken place, but inſiſts that Helen was not there. Having long argued againſt this fact and againſt the authenticity of ſome Cyprian verſes which mention it; having endeavoured as much as he could to illuſtrate Homer, reverting to his hiſtory, he ſays, * *adieu now to Homer and the Cyprian verſes.* Theſe words I will juſt obſerve are tranſlated by Mr. Bryant. "Away with them together, a long farewell to each, both to Homer and the Cyprian verſes." This ſpecimen will put the reader on his guard againſt Mr. Bryant's tranſlations, and will ſhew him what was in reality the *great and contemptuous diſdain* in which Herodotus held Homer. The paſſage † from which Mr. Bryant

NOTES.

* Herodotus, l. ii. c. 118. p. 157. Ὁμήρου μεν νυν ἡ τα Κυπρια επεα χαιρετω. Bryant, p. 90. The elegant and judicious criticiſm which precedes theſe words, is ſurely a very ſtrange mode of teſtifying contempt, and it is not uſual for an author to elucidate ſo elaborately a work he deſpiſes, or to be the biographer of the Poet whom he treats with diſdain.

† The Stranger Venus, to whom a Chapel is dedicated in the temple of Proteus in Egypt, I conceive to be Helen, the daughter of Tyndarus, both becauſe I am informed that Helen was hoſpitably entertained for ſome time by Proteus, and alſo becauſe that *the Stranger* is a name by which Venus was never called in any other place; but, more than all, in anſwer to my inquiries concerning Helen, the Prieſts informed me that Alexander having carried her off from her huſband in Sparta, was on his return home, driven by a violent and contrary wind into the Canobic Mouth of the Nile; that there he was accuſed by his own Slaves, who related the whole tranſaction of Helen's rape, and the injury inflicted upon Menelaus, to Thonis, the chief officer of the diſtrict; and that Thonis, immediately by the following meſſage, reported their informa-

tion.

Bryant quotes; tranſlated as far as it belongs to this queſtion, the reader will find in the note below; and thence learn to eſtimate the

NOTE.

tion to Proteus, the King at Memphis: "A Stranger, by birth a Teucrian, who has done an unhallowed deed in Greece, has arrived here, he has ſeduced the Wife of his Hoſt, and with her and abundant wealth he has been driven on your coaſts by a ſtorm. Shall we then diſmiſs him with impunity, or make a ſeizure of ſuch articles as are in his poſſeſſion?" to which Proteus returned an order to this effect: "Of whatſoever nation the perpetrator of ſuch an impious breach of hoſpitality may be, ſeize and ſend him to me, that I may know what he can ſay in his own defence." Thonis accordingly ſecured the perſon of Alexander, and detained his ſhips, and ſent him and Helen, with their effects, and alſo the Slaves to Memphis, where, being examined by Proteus, Alexander both freely acknowledged the family from which he ſprung, told the name of his country, and related alſo the courſe of his voyage; but prevaricating in his anſwer to the King's inquiry, whence he had taken Helen, the evidence of the Slaves was received to all the circumſtances of that criminal tranſaction, and Alexander was accordingly convicted. Proteus then pronounced this ſentence: "Did I not hold ſacred the life of a ſtranger, I would now, by taking your's, avenge the injury you have done to the Grecian. O meaneſt, baſeſt of mankind, who, not content with the ſacrilegious violation of hoſpitality in ſeducing the wife of your hoſt, have proceeded ſtill farther, to bear her away from him, and with her the effects of her plundered Lord, your life is ſafe, for you are a ſtranger, and I am now your hoſt; but the woman and her wealth I will not permit you to remove, but reſerve them for your Grecian hoſt till he ſhall pleaſe to claim them. For yourſelf and the aſſociates of your voyage, I command you within three days to leave my realm, on pain of being elſe conſidered as enemies."—Such according to the Egyptian Prieſts was the arrival of Helen at the Court of Proteus, and Homer, though he has not adopted it, (for it was not to his purpoſe) has nevertheleſs by ſome alluſions perſuaded me that he had received the ſame account; he evidently refers to the circuitous voyage of Alexander, and intimates his having touched at Sidon in Phœnicia along with Helen.—Hecuba, in the Iliad, takes from her wardrobe

"Works of Sidonian women, whom her ſon,
The godlike Paris, when he croſſed the ſeas
With Jove-begotten Helen, brought to Troy." ILIAD vi. 289.

And Helen in the Odyſſey, medicates the wine of Menelaus, and his gueſts with herbs of ſtrange potency.

"Such drugs Jove's daughter owned, with ſkill prepared,
And of prime virtue, by the wife of Thone,
Egyptian Polydamna, given her." ODYSS. iv. 227.

Menelaus alſo tells Telemachus, that

"As yet the Gods on Egypt's ſhore detained
Me wiſhing home, angry at my neglect
To heap their altars with ſlain hecatombs. ODYSS. iv. 351.

It is hence manifeſt that Homer was acquainted with the voyage of Alexander into Egypt, for Syria,

the literary indifference with which Mr. Bryant affects to conſider the truth or falſehood of his hypotheſis. But what is the natural inference from all this ſtory? That a ſeparate tradition of the war of Troy was preſerved in the annals of Mr. Bryant's favourite country; that his much reſpected Egyptian prieſts corroborate Homer, ſince Thone and Proteus were both known to them; that Menelaus had really arrived there, and we have even a circumſtantial narration of his conduct. How will Mr. Bryant controvert the Egyptians on their own ground, or prove againſt their prieſts, that the Troy which they themſelves placed in Phrygia, and all the detail of events in which they miſtakenly coincide with Greek authors, were really to be referred to the annals of their own country? If in the time of Herodotus their traditions did not reach high enough, is it highly probable, that Mr. Bryant, after an interval of more than 2000 years ſhould diſcover the truth of an Egyptian ſtory, contrary to the concurring evidence of the whole body of Grecian, Egyptian, and Aſiatic hiſtory, as preſerved by the Egyptian † prieſts at the time of Herodotus. "Of theſe facts," ſays the hiſtorian, "ſome were the reſult of much diligent enquiry; others they knew for certain as having happened among themſelves:" yet ſuch is the author, and ſuch is the paſſage, a part of which we here find miſquoted

NOTES.

Syria is on the confines of Egypt, and the Phœnicians, to whom Sidon belongs, inhabit Syria. Theſe paſſages, therefore, indiſputably prove that the Cyprian verſes, in which Alexander is ſaid to have ſailed with a proſperous gale in three days from Sparta to Ilium, belong to ſome other poet and not to Homer, who thus declares that Alexander when carrying Helen off, returned by a very wide and wandering courſe.—But we now take leave of Helen and the Cyprian verſes.

† Herodotus mentions a tradition prevalent in Aſia, and deſcribing the Greeks as the aggreſſors, to which they attributed the long animoſity that involved the nations in perpetual wars, and which terminated only with the Perſian monarchy. This tradition he acquired at Perſepolis. See Herodot. Clio. ch. 1.

in ſupport of Mr. Bryant's hypotheſis. The reader will judge whether Mr. Bryant could be ignorant of the inferences which followed from the paſſage, and will be either indignant or amuſed at the adroit manner in which he has kept back the remainder of this account. Euripides follows Herodotus in ſuppoſing Helen not to have been at Troy; but ſo far from inſinuating that the reſt of the ſtory was fabulous, he founds many of his plays on it as on a well-known fact. His authority on what he poſitively aſſerts is, therefore, at leaſt as good as on the ſingle point he denies. When he or Herodotus mention that Helen was not at Troy during the ſiege; this certainly implies that there was a Troy, and that there was a ſiege; otherwiſe, I would aſk Mr. Bryant whether they would have ſaid ſhe was abſent from a place where no one was preſent. All theſe authorities, therefore, are, unfortunately for Mr. Bryant, in direct oppoſition to his hypotheſis.—But as arguments from Egypt are more immediately concluſive againſt him on this ſubject, it may not be irrelevant from our purpoſe to aſk him here, how the traditions, and early hiſtories of Troy in Egypt came to be ſo completely deſtroyed, as that nothing relative to this plagiariſm of Homer ſhould appear when the Ptolemies called together Zenodotus, Ariſtophanes, and Ariſtarchus, whoſe very name is proverbial of ſeverity. We muſt conſider alſo that theſe men reviſed Homer in Egypt, whoſe traditions were coæval with her prieſthood, and whoſe library at Alexandria was the wonder of the world. Let every reader alſo recollect that * Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius were librarians of this very collection, and yet how often do they

NOTE.

* Callimachus Εἰς Αρτεμιν. l. 230.

mention

mention this part of ancient hiſtory, without even dreaming of its ſuppoſed Egyptian origin. The other teſtimonies are as follows. Strabo mentions a learned Lady, Heſtiæa Alexandrina, who wrote concerning Troy, but could not, ſays Mr. Bryant, diſcover its ſituation. Demetrius of Scepſis was in the ſame ignorance, and from theſe Strabo gives his account. In one circumſtance they all agree, that the ſituation of the modern town of Ilium was not that of the ancient Troy: they alſo agree in repreſenting moſt of the tombs of the heroes, and many other landmarks mentioned by Homer as ſtill exiſting in their time: they ſeem all however to be perſuaded of the exiſtence of Troy, and therefore certainly did not ſuſpect that ſo ſtrong an inference as Mr. Bryant's could be drawn from their ignorance of its ſituation. That Strabo had not viſited the Troad in perſon, is certain, ſince however Mr. Bryant may contend for the contrary, we find him every where quoting Demetrius in this part of his work, and qualifying thoſe paſſages, of which he was in doubt by referring to him, or arguing on the poſſibility of his being miſtaken. It is after him that * Strabo quotes Heſtiæa; after having recorded the controverſy reſpecting New Ilium, and giving a deſcription of the plain, he ſays, † Εμπειρος δ' ων των τοπων ως αν επιχωριος ανηρ ο Δημητριος τοτε μεν ουτως λεγει περι αυτων. Demetrius, a man well acquainted with the country, and a native of the place, gives this account of them. Relative to the ‡ Rheſus in the next page, he quotes him again. In the § pages before this, we find for ever, Υπονοει Δημητριος; Φησι Δημητριος ο Σκεπψιος. In another place having argued his account

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. 189. p. 599.—† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 602.—‡ Strabo, ibid ibid. "Demetrius imagines."

§ Strabo, l. xiii. p. 596. alſo p. 594. "Demetrius of Scepſis ſays."

to

to imply a contradiction, he ſays, " but I approve *the reſt, and think that in general we may rely upon Demetrius, an acute man and born in the country." Is this the conciſe and clear language of Strabo on a place where he had been? or with his extenſive knowledge of Homer, would he have quoted Demetrius for what he had ſeen himſelf and could ſo ably judge of? or would he endeavour to controvert Demetrius, by ſhewing an inconſiſtency in his account, if he could have contradicted the fact itſelf from his own obſervation? The authority therefore of Strabo, is only that of Demetrius and Heſtiæa; and to what does it amount? to prove that new Ilium was not Troy, and that the old town was ſo deſtroyed they could not find it. This laſt circumſtance Mr. Bryant thinks concluſive. How did Strabo ſee it? †Εικοτως, ſays he, " it is *probable;* for when all the diſtrict was ruined, and the other towns laid waſte, but not deſtroyed, Troy, which was entirely overturned, was made uſe of to repair the others." Of theſe Sigæum was one. Demetrius, as we are told, in the next‡ page, accuſed Timæus of a blunder in aſſerting that Achilleum, a village near it, was built of the ſtones of Troy by Periander; but he ſays the nature of the ſtone was not the ſame as that of Troy; a circumſtance which ſhews him to be well acquainted with it. " This is the evidence of a native of the very diſtrict," and if he could not find the city he ſeems at leaſt to have found the ſtones belonging to it.

But Steſichorus, an author prior to Herodotus, had the ſame opinion that he has, ſays Mr. Bryant, ſince he maintained that

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. xiii. p. 603. Τἄλλα δὲ ἀπολαμβάνομεν ἢ τὰ τε πλεῖςα δεῖν περοσέχειν, ὡς ἀνδρὶ ἐμπείρῳ καὶ ἐντοπίῳ.

† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 599.—‡ Strabo, ibid, p. 600.

Helen

Helen was never upon the ſea. In the firſt place as Herodotus mentions her being in Egypt, I hardly know by what other means ſhe could get there, unleſs we ſuppoſe her to have made a very curious circuit indeed. But "Steſichorus flouriſhed in the 42d Olympiad;" therefore Anaxagoras and Metrodorus were not the moſt ancient authors, as we had been aſſured a few pages before. It is a ſtory told alſo of Steſichorus, that Venus ſtruck him blind for his blaſpheming, and that he retracted all that he had affirmed; from hence we may infer that his hiſtory is not particularly authentic, nor can we place implicit reliance on the whole of it. But though Venus might not ſtrike him blind, we have, at leaſt, juſt as good authority for his retractation as we have for his original writing, and if Mr. Bryant can argue ſo ſtrongly from his firſt work, I have equal right to build upon his palinodia. We only know his work, as quoted by Dion Chryſoſtom, who like Mr. Bryant was ſupporting an hypotheſis; it was however an hypotheſis from which Mr. Bryant can derive but little ſtrength; for ſo far was he from denying the exiſtence of the Phrygian Troy, that he contends for its having ſurvived the ſiege, και μη αλωναι. he only denies its fall, and from the ſilence of the Grecian Homer reſpecting the final event, infers the defeat of the Poet's countrymen, and concludes that Ilium had repulſed the Greeks. To whatever Homer has affirmed, he accedes, and then only feels himſelf at liberty to indulge his imagination, when the incontrovertible teſtimony of the Iliad offers no obſtacle to an hypotheſis which is ſo evidently written in ſport, that it is wonderful to hear him ſeriouſly quoted on any occaſion by ſo grave a writer as Mr. Bryant, whoſe arguments I now conceive to be fully anſwered. I will therefore conclude with his own triumphant quotation, which the reader will poſſibly apply rather differently. Cujuſvis hominis eſt errare, nullius niſi inſipientis in errorem perſevĕrare.

Colonies of Greeks and Trojans, and memorials of the war, a proof of the veracity of Homer.

Mr. Bryant in his next* chapter enumerates the immenſe number of Colonies, which in after ages claimed their deſcent from the victors or vanquiſhed of this memorable æra. He notices alſo the different altars and memorials ſaid to be left by them in various and improbable parts of Europe. Theſe circumſtances have been uſed as an argument, and ſurely a juſt one, to prove the exiſtence of the Trojan war; not it is true from the authenticity of theſe ſettlements, but from the generality of opinion which the ſuppoſition implies, even if it be falſe. Whilſt we can account for exaggeration in the national vanity of after times, we can account for the original idea no otherwiſe than by ſuppoſing its truth, ſince the colonies who pretended to derive their origin from Æneas, Diomede, or Menelaus, certainly believed that ſuch perſons had exiſted. They likewiſe agree in placing them with Troy in Phrygia, and the general outline of their ſtory is the ſame with that of Homer, however their vanity may have altered ſome particulars which were not adapted to their national pretenſions. Returning to Homer, we find in his plain narration, few of theſe inconſiſtencies. Æneas lived and reigned in Troas, and the traditions of the Scepſians corroborate this account. As to the other ſtories, it is very poſſible many colonies were founded, for the victors returning home, were in many places vanquiſhed in their turn. Driven from home as they had driven the Trojans, both parties ſought a refuge elſewhere. Such were frequently the colonies of the early ages, unleſs the account that is univerſally

NOTE.

* Concerning the argument which is founded on the many memorials of the Trojan war, ſuppoſed to have been extant in different parts of the world. Bryant, p. 92. and Corollary, ditto, p. 98.

given

given of them by the ancients is to be ſuperſeded in favour of Mr. Bryant's heroes, the Tyrians, Sidonians, and Cuthites.

Homer's names not applied arbitrarily to mere creatures of his imagination.

In another very ſingular * chapter Mr. Bryant enumerates the names of the heroes who were worſhipped or rather revered in different places, and who received heroic honours in countries where they had little right to expect them. Theſe he quotes chiefly from the "latebræ Lycophronis atri," of which the extreme obſcurity is univerſally acknowledged. He concludes that the beings ſo † worſhipped were gods, whoſe titles or whoſe ſecondary appellations Homer conferred upon his heroes. Would ‡ Homer, who is the ſtricteſt obſerver of coſtume, give to fictitious characters names unknown or unuſed by his countrymen? If not, why might not ſuch names be real ones at the time? But if the beings ſo worſhipped were the heroes of Homer, the fact proves at once both their exiſtence and their celebrity. In either caſe Mr. Bryant will find it impoſſible to draw from theſe data any inference which does not militate againſt his hypotheſis.

No inference to be drawn from ſo unſupported a conjecture as Mr. Bryant's on the Country of Homer.

For ſeveral pages after this Mr. Bryant contends ſtrongly that Homer was not an Aſiatic but a native of Greece, probably of

NOTES.

* Concerning the heroes who were deified.

† The general plan of Lycophron is perſpicuous enough, and accords with Homer. A Nuntius relates to Priam the prophecies of his impriſoned daughter Caſſandra, and by her δυσφάτοι αἰνιγμάλων ὕιμαι the ſcene and characters are ſufficiently aſcertained. The ſcene is Phrygia, the characters Greeks and Trojans. This is the more worth notice, becauſe the Poet lived in Egypt under Ptolemy Lagus; and yet no Egyptian tradition occurred to him, though his character for reſearch and antiquarian learning was ſuch, that of all men he was perhaps the moſt likely to detect and expoſe the error of his countrymen.

‡ See notes on Agamemnon, p. 59.

Ithaca,

Ithaca, and of Egyptian origin, this he had already inſinuated, and I have waved the conteſt, ſince mere conjecture requires no anſwer. I ſhall do the ſame here, owning, that in ſome points I have the pleaſure of agreeing with him, and not knowing any real authority that either contradicts or confirms one tittle of his aſſertions. Beſides this I am able ſafely to give him here, at leaſt, a tacit acquieſcence, ſince I cannot perceive that any ſort of inference reſults from the eſtabliſhment of either ſide of the queſtion.

Recapitulation. From the thorough deſtruction of his ſuppoſed ſeries of evidence, I come to a concluſion diametrically oppoſite to Mr. Bryant's. If Homer bears ſuch a ſemblance of truth; if Varro and Juſtin do not refute his veracity; if the grounds of the war were probable and natural, the men engaged in it, and the conduct of it ſuch as might be expected; if Thucydides, Diodorus, and Herodotus, both confirm and account for it; if the accounts given of the numbers and ſhips of the Greeks are credible, and if their proceedings in Troas, as far as are recorded are conſonant to nature; if their correſpondence with Greece and the age of Helen, and of the Lovers and Suitors, all prove nothing againſt the fact; if the objection about the Arcadian mariners is without any foundation; if the foſs and rampart were ſuch as might eaſily be deſtroyed, and the topographical objections every where founded on miſtaken notions, as I ſhall now endeavour to prove; it follows that all concluſions drawn from ſuch premiſes are annihilated, and therefore that Troy may have exiſted notwithſtanding the objections of Mr. Bryant. There ſeems beſides to be ſtill leſs reaſon for ſuppoſing it to have exiſted in Egypt. Conjectures upon Homer's life and writings may be anſwered by other conjectures, but in reality as they prove nothing, they need not be anſwered at all; Homer's

acquaintance

acquaintance with Egypt is ſlight ground for ſuch an inference; of the writers who treated the ſubject, only one (Phantaſia) is ſaid to be an Egyptian, and her name confutes the ſtory. Not one is mentioned as placing Troy out of Phrygia either before or ſince, ſo that if it belonged to Egypt, ſuch a concurrence in favour of one particular ſpot is wholly incredible. Therefore we muſt either ſuppoſe Phantaſia wrote on a Greek ſtory, or that Homer, Syagrius, Dictys, Dares, and other Greeks, wrote on an Egyptian one, and both ideas are equally abſurd. The ancient traditions for ever are in contradiction with reſpect to the particulars, many different accounts are tranſmitted, but moſt of them are ſubſequent to Homer, whoſe conſiſtency bears great internal marks of truth, and not one tradition or ſtory, either ancient or modern, ever removed Homer's Ilium to Egypt, till the attempt of Mr. Bryant. If I have accounted for the difficulties which he finds in reſpect to the Greek names and Grecian worſhip introduced by Homer into Phrygia; if the names ſaid to be borrowed by Homer from the deities, were, in his time, probably the common names of his country; if the Egyptian derivation of Agamemnon is without proof; and if his own authorities, ſo far from aſſiſting him when they are fairly quoted, really diſprove his arguments; if the memorials found in the different parts of the world, and the deification of Homer's heroes are really confirmations of the received opinion, the conſequence follows that we have no ſort of ground, from any argument Mr. Bryant has uſed, to ſuppoſe that the ſcenes of the Iliad were originally foreign to Phrygia, but we have many unanſwerable reaſons to believe the reverſe. Having ſhewn therefore, as I truſt, that Ilium did not exiſt in Egypt; having before ſhewn that there is no reaſon to doubt the ancient ſtory concerning the war in Phrygia, it ſhall be my effort to convince

 the

the reader that it did exiſt, and in the very ſituation where Homer has placed it.

PART THE SECOND.

Introduction.

Of all the arguments which have been uſed in ſupport of ancient hiſtorians there is none ſo concluſive as that which is drawn from the exact concurrence of their topography, with what we find *to be the preſent ſtate of the country*. Their accuracy, in points of which we are able to judge, is a rational ground of belief in thoſe for which we have only their uncontradicted aſſertion. But there is no hiſtorian, however exact, who can compare in this reſpect with Homer. The ingenious publication of Monſieur Chevalier, had ſhown that many more circumſtances illuſtrative of the Iliad might ſtill be traced in the Plain than were generally imagined to be there. His work had to combat with incredulity, which will ever attend a diſcovery of this ſort unſupported by concurrent teſtimony. That teſtimony I am happy to be able to give, for though I may perhaps ſometimes differ with him in his conjectures, yet I found him every where a faithful relater of facts. Aſſiſted by his book, I examined the whole country with ſome degree of attention, and before I proceed any further I beg to refer the reader, through the whole of this treatiſe, to the ſubjoined Map, of which the chief part exactly agrees with that of M. Chevalier; ſince I found it (except ſome trifling overſights which are here corrected) as accurate as that of Mr. Bryant's is erroneous and defective. To make theſe arguments more concluſive, I previouſly inform the reader, that conſidering, *a priori*, the ſituations, and remains which Homer's writings would lead us to expect, I will ſhow that

in

Erin
Thymbrius fl.
Atché Keu
Simois fl.
Hectoris tum.
Batoukli
Pulæ Scepsis
Simois fl.
Troja
Situs
Apollinis Templum
Halil Eli
Callicolone
Thymbrek
Bounarbachi
Tchiblack
Scææ Portæ
Fons Calidus
Fons Frigidus
Æne
Erineos
ERETUM HELLESPONTI
Rhæteum Prom.
Aianteum s. Ajacis tumulus
Simois fl.
Bos
Scamander s. Xanthus
Fors: Ili tumulus
Pulæ Scamander
Udjek
Udjek tapé s. Æsyetis tumulus
Koum Kalé
Erkissiqui
Gheisli
Feranli
Patroch tumulus
Achillis tumulus
Ieni Cheyr
Sigæum Prom.
Scamander amnis navigabilis Plinii
Fors: Antilochi tumulus
Dahri
Aqueductus
Alexandria S. Troas
Ieni Keu
Beschik tapé
Castella de Tat
Mastusia Prom.
Novum Scamandri ostium
ÆGEUM MARE

in moſt points our expectations may be gratified, and will endeavour to anſwer the topographical arguments which Mr. Bryant has brought forward both here, and in his previous publication on this ſubject.

On the ſituation and extent of the plain.

According to Homer's deſcription the armies are repeatedly engaged in a plain between Troy and the ſhips, and in all this ſpace it no where appears that there were any defiles, or mountain paſſes,† as theſe were circumſtances which Homer could not fail to mention, ſince they would have given a different character to the whole tenor of his battles. Through this plain two rivers ‡ the Simois and the Xanthus poured their waters; the chain § of Ida commanded it on one ſide, ſince Gargarus, one of its ſummits, is repeatedly mentioned as overlooking the city and Plain; a part of Ida, called Callicolone, or the beautiful hill, ‖ was near the city and the Simois; the plain ** on the other ſide was bounded by the Helleſpont, and alſo by the more open ſea as we may learn from the †† deſcriptions of an extenſive ocean, which are inapplicable to the ſtraits of Abydos. The extent of the Plain was ſuch as to contain two armies one of fifty thouſand, the other of a hundred

NOTES.

† Hom. Il. ii. ver. 465. Ibid. 812.

‡ Juno and Minerva deſcend at their confluence. Hom. Il. v. ver. 774.

§ Hom. Il. viii. ver. 47. Ibid. xi. ver. 183. Ibid. ver. 337. Ibid. xiv. ver. 157. Ibid. xv. ver. 5.

‖ Hom. Il. xx. ver. 53.

** The Camp of the Grecians was near the Helleſpont. Il. xvii. v. 432. and paſſim.

†† Homer, Il. i. v. 34. Ibid. i. v. 327. Ib. xxiii. ver. 59. alſo xxiii. ver, 230. where this Sea, is called Θρηικιος πονλος. "The Thracian Sea."

thouſand

thouſand men in order of battle,* nay more, when they combated at the ſhips,† to place them at a conſiderable diſtance from the city: Had the city and the ſhips been very near each other, the encampment of the Trojans near the Scamander and the tomb of Ilus, would have been uſeleſs, but Hector aſſigns as the reaſon for that encampment, that the Grecians might otherwiſe attempt to eſcape ‡ in the night: the City therefore was not in ſuch a ſituation, as to command the Grecian camp. In this deſcription it will be obſerved, that I make the Helleſpont of Homer ſynonimous with the Helleſpont of every other writer, and the ſame as the ſtraits of Abydos. Mr. Bryant § maintains that they were different: Homer, he ſays, uſes the Helleſpont for the upper part of the Ægean, and it bounded Myſia to the Eaſt. How any part of the Ægean, which is on the weſt coaſt of Aſia Minor, bounded an Aſiatic province to the Eaſt, I am at a loſs to comprehend. Homer, however, calls the Helleſpont πλάτυς i. e. broad, ἀγαρροος, flowing ſtrongly, or with a ſtrong current, απειρων, ‖ impervious; but *broad*, which is merely a comparative term, is applied with a reference to rivers, and other confined channels; flowing ſtrongly is not the epithet of the ſea, but is particularly appropriate to the ſtraits of the Helleſpont, down which there is a very rapid current; απειρων which is tranſlated *boundleſs* by Mr. Bryant means only *difficult of paſſage*, *impervious*, *or little navigated;* (ἀ priv. and πειρω tranſeo.)** απειρων, ω Κιθαιρων, εκ

N O T E S.

* Homer, Il. v. 543. κ.τ.λ.

† Εκαθεν πολεως κοιλης επι νηυσι. Il. v. ver. 791. alſo Il. xviii. 256.

‡ Hom. Il. viii. ver. 510 —§ Mr. Bryant "on the War of Troy," p. 157.

‖ Sigæa igni freta lata relucent. Virgil. Fretum it will be obſerved always means a Strait. Therefore, Virgil uſes the word *Lata* in exactly the ſame ſenſe with Homer's πλάτυς, and both apply them to the Straits of the Dardanelles; perhaps to that part of them near the Sigean, more particularly as being comparatively broader than the parts immediately above the Troad.

** Sophocles. Oedip. Tyrannus. l. 1088 and ſec.

εσει

εσει τον αυριον πανσελκνον is an expreſſion of Sophocles, where the word is uſed in this ſenſe, and the epithet is applied to Mount Cithæron. The * ſea, however, αλς θαλασσα, was near the Grecian camp, particularly near the ſtation of Achilles, and this I alſo mean to prove was the caſe. But ſays Mr. Bryant, the very words † Ελλης πολπος, -πορτος imply an extent of ſea. How little then did the ‡ Greeks underſtand their own language, who applied thoſe words to the ſtrait of Abydos for ages afterwards; and how little adroit were the inventors of the ſtory of Helle, who make a ram attempt to carry her double acroſs ſuch an expanſe of water! There are proofs that the Helleſpont was in every other author, the ſtrait of Abydos, and when Mr. Bryant, therefore, calls upon his adverſaries to ſhow that Homer's Helleſpont was here, it is, in fact, incumbent upon him to prove the contrary.

On the ſixth of November, 1794, I arrived from Leſbos at the ſouthern part of Ida, in company with other Engliſhmen. ‖ We landed above 20 miles below Lectum, now C. Baba, in the Sinus Adramyttenus. The mountains riſe gradually from the promontory of Lectum in long ridges, which unite on the right in a high ſummit, the ancient Gargarus, and thence bending northward form a wild maſs above Scepſis and Æne: From theſe the Simois, and many other rivers take their riſe. Leaving theſe on our right we croſſed the chain to the coaſt at Alexandria Troas, now Eſki Stambol. Romantic dells, wild rocks, and brawling Alpine tor-

NOTES.

* See the note on page 79.—† Mr. Bryant on the war of Troy, p. 159.

‡ See the Hero and Leander of Muſæus throughout; ſee Pauſanias, Strabo, and in ſhort every author that has mentioned it; for not one is quoted by Mr. Bryant in contradiction.

‖ Mr. Dallaway and Mr. Stockdale.

rents characterize the* Ιδην πολυπιδακα μητερα Θηρων : but no river here runs down to the Ægean, and thoſe who, miſled by Mr. Bryant, ſeek here for the Simois and Scamander, will never be able to diſcover either the plain or the rivers. We were every where within a few miles of the coaſt, and often ſaw the ſea; the crags of Ida riſe rapidly from it on both ſides of Lectum, and from the ſhore inland the country is all mountain. Above Alexandria a gentler ſlope hangs more gradually down to the ſea. At the foot of this, round its port, ſtood once Alexandria Troas, of which many ruins ſtill remain. It has been on all hands granted that Troy was not here; indeed here is no plain, and the little ſtreams which flow from ſome baths behind the town, and join on the bare dell that there runs down to the ſea, have no pretenſions to be taken either for the Simois, or Scamander. Belon, who thought he recogniſed Troy here, owns with moſt perfect truth, "that the rivers Simois and † Xanthus, (for ſo he calls them) are ſuch diminutive brooks they would hardly maintain a loach or a minnow, that in ſummer they are dried up, and in winter a gooſe could not ſwim in them." Such are the rivers which this part of the coaſt furniſhes in ſupport of Mr. Bryant's hypotheſis. A long range of lower hills from hence form the ſhore, unbroken but by ſmall ſtreams, till you come to the mouth of one which I ſhall ſhew was once the Scamander. Immediately beyond it is Cape Janizari, which is the Sigæum of antiquity, and the coaſt from hence is flat, and extends for about three miles along the Helleſpont; a perfect plain.

Here then we recognize the characteriſtics of Homer's ſcene as mentioned in the firſt part of the chapter. A large river here falls

NOTES.

* "Ida the well-watered, the mother of wild beaſts."—† Belon's Voyages, liv. ii. ch. 6.

into

into the ſea, another ſtream has already been mentioned; the Helleſpont bounds this plain on one ſide; to the weſt extends the "Θαλασσα πολυφλοισβος," the tumultuous ocean: Ida riſes behind it and ſhuts it entirely in. This plain affords an ample field for the exertions of the two armies: The harbour and camp of the Greeks would be formed by the mouth of the Simois; the plain is in parts, about four miles acroſs; and in its utmoſt length I conceive it to be under nine miles. The general geography of the plain, therefore, agrees in all theſe reſpects with Homer, and as he has never mentioned the names of Sigæum * or Rheteum it is foreign to my purpoſe to introduce them here as the boundaries of the plain.—The accounts given of them by other ancient Authors, I ſhall notice hereafter. But an objection made by Mr. Bryant † to this geography is that it places Gargarus at too great a diſtance from the plain. He makes Lectum and Gargarus the ſame, which is contrary to Strabo, and to Homer. If we turn to the firſt, we find Lectum mentioned in theſe terms. "Homer ‡ deſcribes "Lectum well, both as it was a part of Ida, and becauſe to thoſe "who approach from the ſea towards Ida, it is the firſt point "of landing," αποβασις "that offers itſelf, but having enumerated "the extreme prominencies of Ida, Lectum, and Zeleia, he mentions "alſo with propriety the ſummit of it Gargarus, *a pointed eminence*,§ "and even now," ſays he, "in the higheſt parts of Ida ‖ Gargarus, is "ſhewn

NOTES.

* See Mr. Bryant's Obſervations on a Treatiſe, &c. p. 5.

† Mr. Bryant on the War of Troy, p. 160, and ſeq.

‡ Strabo, l. xiii. p. 583, 584.—§ A pointed eminence ακρον λογον. in the original.

‖ Lucas in arce fuit ſummâ Æn. ix. 86. Hoc eſt apud Gargara, quæ dicta ſunt quaſi καρα κρατος.

"" ſhewn, in which is ſituated Gargara, a city of Æolia." In a ſubſequent page we have this calculation: "After *Lectum is the town " Polymedium at forty ſtadia, then a ſmall grove at eighty more, " then at 140 Gargara;" therefore from Lectum to Gargarus was a diſtance of 260 ſtadia, that is, without diſcuſſing the preciſe meaſure of a ſtadium, about thirty miles, a diſtance greater than from Gargarus to Troy. Mr. Bryant, however, contends that, ſince Homer brings Jupiter to Gargarus, to look down on the city and plain, the plain muſt have been extended immediately to the foot of the mountain. Strabo, he ſays,† makes the coaſt from Lectum to Abydos, about fifty miles, of which Ilium was rather more than half, that is 200 ſtadia, or about 26 miles. At the ſame time he adds, that the whole country was divided by ridges precluding all diſtant view. It will be obſerved by the reader that he argues as if the view from Gargarus were the ſame with that from Lectum, when they were 30 miles aſunder. Gargarus we find was much higher; it was alſo nearer Troy, for Lectum runs out weſtward into the Ægean. But even ſuppoſing the view to be taken from Lectum, his own Author directly confutes his arguments. In the very place Mr. Bryant has juſt quoted, Strabo has this paſſage, which is however omitted in the quotation: " Upon‡ Lectum an altar of the twelve Gods is ſeen, it is called the " fane or ſeat, ιδρυμα, of Agamemnon; this place is in ſight εν εποψει "" of Ilium, at the diſtance of two hundred ſtadia, or rather more."

NOTES.

κρατος. id eſt Caput Capitis; Altitudinis altitudo, καρα eſt η κεφαλη. Gargara autem ſunt montis Idæ cacumina. propter quod dixit in arce ſummâ. Servius. See alſo Macrobius and Lactantius, the Annotator of Statius.

* Strabo, l. xiii. p. 606.—† Mr. Bryant on the War of Troy, p. 163, 164.

‡ Strabo, l. xiii. p. 902, (605 of the margin.)

Where

Where then are the ridges deſcribed ſo apropos by Mr. Bryant? If human eyes could ſee the altar of Lectum from Ilium, much more could thoſe of Jupiter view Ilium from Gargarus; a leſs diſtance from a higher ſummit. Indeed the topography of the country confirms Strabo beyond confutation. On the ſouth of the plain the hills riſe gradually up to Gargarus, which is a prominent feature* in the outline, and the only one of the ſummits of Ida which is ſeen from the plain. Homer conſidered it as the higheſt point of Ida, and therefore choſe that throne for the King of the Gods. It is perhaps 25 miles from the Helleſpont, and domineers over the whole country. The ſituation *was* ſtill more appropriate, ſince he was the tutelar Deity of the town of Gargara "ενθα δε οιτεμενος τε βωμος τε θυηεις."† Now if the reader wiſhes to be acquainted with the ſtrength of eyeſight ‡ Homer allots to his Gods, he will find in the Iliad § this account of Neptune,

> Meantime the Monarch of the wat'ry main
> Obſerv'd the Thund'rer, nor obſerv'd in vain.
> In Samothracia, on a mountain's brow
> Whoſe waving woods o'erhung the deeps below,
> He ſat, and round him caſt his azure eyes,
> Where Ida's miſty tops confus'dly riſe,
> Below fair Ilion's glitt'ring ſpires were ſeen,
> The crowded ſhips and ſable ſeas between. ‖

NOTES.

* See the adjoined View from the Sigæan Promontory.

† Where he had a fane and an altar for ſacrifice.

‡ Οξυς θεων οφθαλμος εις τα παντα ιδειν. Euripid. ex Stobæo.—§ Hom. Il. xiii. l. 10.

‖ Upon the ſame ſyſtem with Mr. Bryant we might diſpute the diſtance of Ægæ, ſince Neptune went thither from Salamis in three ſtrides.

The maps of the country will tell Mr. Bryant that this view of Neptune was taken from a much greater diſtance than that of his brother Jupiter. Since, therefore, the lofty ſummit of Gargarus is ſeen from the plain, and forms a commanding feature in the outline of the landſcape; I conceive all objections of this ſort are thoroughly anſwered, and the reader will admire the grandeur with which Homer exalts his Sovereign of the Gods, more, perhaps, than if he had conformed to the ſhort-ſighted ſyſtem of Mr. Bryant.

On the nature of the Plain and of the Rivers.

The ſame preciſion which points out ſo accurately the ſituation of the plain, is alſo obſervable in the different epithets and deſcriptions which are applied to it in the Iliad. The fertility of it is noticed more than once, and the diſtrict of Troy is generally marked out as a rich ſoil, the Τροιη εριβωλαξ. The lower part of the plain is, in general, deſcribed as overgrown with reeds and aquatic plants, the conſequences probably of a marſh near the junction of the rivers, which is mentioned by Homer * once in the 21ſt Book. Thus when Diomede and Ulyſſes are engaged on their night excurſion, the latter ſuſpends the arms of Dolon upon a Marſh Myrtle (Μυρίκη) † and marks the road by which he is to return with heaps of reeds (Δοναχες), ‡ and branches of the myrtle. The various characteriſtics of the Simois and Scamander, are pointed out with a ſtill greater degree of minuteneſs, and every where with the ſame accuracy. They joined their waters in the

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. l. xxi. ver. 317. —— τά πῦ μάλα νείοθι λίμνης
Κείσεθ' ὑπ ἰλύος κεκαλυμμένα.

† Hom. Il. l. x. ver. 466, ‡67. Alſo the μυρικη is mentioned Il. xxi. ver. 18.

Plain,

Plain, for in the * fifth book, Juno and Minerva deſcend at their confluence. The Scamander roſe in the Plain, near the Scæan Gate, from two ſources, which are thus deſcribed in the † 22nd Book of the Iliad:

Next by Scamander's double ſource they bound,
Where two fam'd fountains burſt the parted ground;
This hot through ſcorching clefts is ſeen to riſe,
With exhalations ſteaming to the ſkies.
That the green banks in Summer's heat o'erflows,
As cryſtal clear, and cold as Winter ſnows.
Each guſhing fount a marble ciſtern fills,
Whoſe poliſh'd bed receives the falling rills;
Where Troy's fair Dames 'ere yet alarm'd by Greece,
Waſh'd their fair garments in the days of Peace.

It was owing to the ſituation of theſe ſources at the foot of Ida, that in "Summer's heat" the ſtream was not dried up, being fed by the gradual and conſtant vapours, which filter through the earth. But the mountain torrents, which depend entirely on the rains of Autumn, or the melting of the ſnows in Spring, always diſappear during the Summer in this warm climate. The epithets applied by Homer to the Scamander, in different parts of his work, are αγλαον υδωρ, καλα ρεεθρα, ανθεμοεις, ηιοεις, αργυροδινης, δινηεις, ευρρειος, ευρροος and once or twice, particularly in the 21ſt Book,‡ βαθυδινηεις and μεγας πόλαμος βαθυδινης. The meadow, through which it runs,

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. v. ver. 774.—† Hom. Il. l. xxii. ver. 147. and ſeq.

‡ Hom. Il. l. xxi. ver. 15, ver. 329 and paſſim.

is alſo ſtyled the *"flowry mead of the Scamander." The other river is mentioned leſs frequently, but ſome of its characteriſtics may, however, be traced in different parts of the Iliad. In the 21ſt book † the Xanthus calls in theſe terms on his ally the Simois,

Haſte my Brother flood,
And check this mortal who controuls a God.—
Call then your ſubject ſtreams, and bid them roar,
From all your fountains ſwell your watry ſtore.
With broken rocks and with a load of dead,
Charge the black ſurge, and pour it on his head.

In the ſeventh book he is deſcribed as

The gulphy Simois rolling to the main,
Helmets and ſhields and godlike heroes ſlain.

We ſee then that whilſt the Scamander is pointed out as a clear, beautiful, perennial ſtream, the Simois is characteriſed as a violent, unequal mountain torrent rolling down in his "black ſurge," ſtones, trees, and dead bodies. It appears alſo that below the junction, the waters of both took the name of Scamander, for in the paſſage juſt quoted from the twenty-firſt book, we find the Xanthus calling to the Simois for aſſiſtance, which would have been very uſeleſs, unleſs the battle was fought below the confluence.

NOTES.

* Ἕξαν δ ἐν λειμῶνι Σκαμανδρίῳ ανθεμόεντι. Hom. Il. ii. ver. 467.

† Hom. Il. l. xxi. v. 308. and ſeq.

No

No mention is made of the Simois ſpringing in the plain, and that many ſtreams joined it in its courſe appears from the ſame quotation. Mr. Bryant, however, contends that Chevalier is miſtaken in all this deſcription.* The epithets δινηεις, ευρροος, ευρρειος, convince him that the Scamander was a larger ſtream than is here deſcribed, and he obſerves that no epithets are beſtowed on what he calls *the ſubordinate and ignoble* Simois. Mr. Bryant, the reader will obſerve, is not ſo ſparing of his epithets as Homer with regard to this river; the character of which muſt be collected from Homer's deſcription. That the Simois was not always ſubordinate and ignoble appears from the Ἴση δὲ μέγα κῦμα, πολυν δόρυμαῖγδον ὄρινε Φιτρῶν ϗ λάων, which is quoted above. That it often is ſo, is the very thing which Monſieur Chevalier allows; his Simois being a very conſiderable mountain river in winter, or after ſevere rains, and being frequently dry in ſummer, which laſt circumſtance he aſſigns as the probable reaſon why the ſtream below the junction retained the name of the Xanthus, which flowed perpetually in the channel. With regard to the epithets of the Scamander, a ſmall ſtream may be both *eddying* δινηεις, and *beautifully flowing* ευρροος, ευρρειος. In the 21ſt Book the battle was below the junction, and here we find it deſcribed as βαθυδινηεις, and μεγας πόλαμος βαθυδινης;† in ſhort if theſe epithets are found in the Iliad, they are always alluſive to the united waters of the two rivers, which as I have already obſerved bore the name of Scamander only. From this circumſtance alone ariſes the alledged inconſiſtency.

The Scamander was alſo on the weſt of the plain, for though

NOTES.

* Mr. Bryant's "Obſervations on a Treatiſe," &c. page. 29, 30.—† See above, l. iv.

Mr. Bryant* conteſts the meaning given by Chevalier to Hector's fighting μαχης επ' αριστερα πασης,† yet I obſerve with pleaſure that this interpretation is confirmed by Ptolemy,‡ who in his geography places them in the following order: Abydos, Dardanum, Simois, Scamander, Sigæum; the Simois, therefore, was neareſt to Dardanum, the Scamander to Sigæum. This paſſage of Ptolemy is quoted in the very next page by Mr. Bryant himſelf. Such are the characteriſtics which Homer points out to us, and which we are by him prepared to expect in the plain of Troy; perhaps in the following deſcription the reader will recognize moſt of them.

The plain of Bounarbachi, which, (as I endeavoured in the laſt chapter to ſhow) coincides with the ſuppoſed ſituation of the plain of Troy, coincides with it alſo in its nature, and the ſituation of the rivers. On landing at Koumkale,§ to which we returned after an excurſion to Abydos, the firſt appearance of the plain is that of a marſh extending near the ſea, and every where of low ſandy ſoil. A little to the eaſt of the town, a ſtream, at that time very conſiderable, diſcharged itſelf into the ſea. At the mouth of this ſtream are very large marſhes, and the river itſelf was exceedingly muddy and full of ſtones and ſand. We croſſed it above the town (Koumkale) over a wooden bridge, and proceeding to the point

NOTES.

* Mr. Bryant's Obſervations upon a Treatiſe, entitled "A Deſcription of the Plain of Troy," p. 30.

† There can be no doubt that the left of the battle with reſpect to Hector muſt mean the left of the Trojan, and conſequently the right of the Grecian army. With reſpect to Ajax and Idomeneus the caſe is reverſed. Neither does Homer place them οχθας παρ ποταμοιο Σκαμανδρω when they are in the left of the fight. If this argument could ſtand in need of confirmation, however, we find that Ptolemy affords it.

‡ Ptol. Geogr. p. 137. Bryant's Obſervations, &c. p. 31.—§ See Map.

marked

marked by Monſ. Chevalier as Rheteum, took the adjoined view *from the barrow*, ſuppoſed the tomb of Ajax.* Of theſe tombs I will ſay more in a ſubſequent Section. In the mean time the reader cannot but obſerve the flat low form of the plain in this part, and the long promontories, which the river has formed by the conſtant accretion of ſand and mud at its mouth. From hence we croſſed over low hills and a narrow vale, now called the vale of Thimbrek, in which we cannot but recognize the Thymbra of Homer and Strabo. We paſſed near Halil Eli, a ſmall Turkiſh village, and then by the other village of Tchiblak. The plain, which had hitherto extended below us on the right, now turning eaſtward lay before us at our feet. The hills to the left form a a beautiful and gay ſcene, covered with verdure and wood. The ſoil here has loſt its marſhy nature, and is *rich and fruitful* εριβωλαξ. The river which we had already croſſed in the morning, rolled along at the foot of theſe beautiful hills, which terminate the plain a little above. Beyond this point the courſe of the river is confined between high romantic precipices. Having croſſed it we aſcended the oppoſite hill to the village of Bounarbachi, where we paſſed the night. The morning after this our firſt object was to examine the nature of the fountains below the village, from which we took the adjoined view. The cold ſpring guſhes out from four or five crevices at the foot of the rock, which forms the foreground of this picture. At the ſmall diſtance here delineated another ſpring riſes, which, at the time I was there,† was of conſiderable warmth. Its waters are even now received into a marble baſon, like thoſe of Homer's Scamander, and in that

NOTES.

* See Chevalier on the Plain of Troy, p. 102 and 106. On the Rhæteum and the tomb of Ajax.

† November 13, 1794.

part

part of the baſon where the water enters, the temperature is ſcarcely of leſs heat than that of the warm ſpring at Briſtol. The Turks who had attended us from Bounarbachi, confirmed the aſſertion of Chevalier, that the water was conſiderably warmer during froſt, and ſteamed very viſibly. If this was the Scamander, then the Scæan gate was near the ſprings, but I ſhall ſay more of this, when I come to conſider the ſituation of the city. After examining what related to the city, we followed the courſe of this ſtream, riding along the foot of the hills which bound the plain to the ſouth and weſt. The warm and cold ſprings very ſoon unite their waters; and roll along in the plain with a beautifully clear current. At the foot of the hills below Erkiſſiqui, the plain becomes marſhy, and is overgrown with ſedges and ruſhes; deſcending thence into the plain we croſſed the Scamander over a bridge, which we had before paſſed in coming from Alexandria. The river here after winding through the marſh changes its courſe, and runs down a valley on the left in a perfectly ſtraight canal. The ground on each ſide of this canal is thrown up, and affords the cleareſt conviction of its having been the work of art.* From hence, therefore, guided by Chevalier, we attempted to trace the ancient channel: A winding bed, in which ſome water ſtill trickles when the Scamander is full, immediately caught our eye; it is of the ſame ſize with the adjoining part of the ſtream where it branches off, and by following the windings of its banks we arrived ſoon after at thoſe of the larger river, into which it has formerly fallen. At and below the conflux, marſh myrtles, oſiers, and aquatic plants, grow in abundance: I have already noticed the

NOTE.

* See Chevalier, page 24.

high

high banks of ſand through which the larger river flows: I will add that in ſummer this laſt is often dry, except where the ſea which inundates the marſhes flows in at the mouth of it. It is always muddy, and rolls down ſtones and fragments from the mountains. But the other, notwithſtanding ſevere rains, was ſtill, when I ſaw it, "like chryſtal clear," and in ſummer its channel is never dry; a property which, in this climate, might well juſtify the epithets of αγλαον υδωρ, &c. I own, throughout every part of this deſcription, I cannot recollect any one local expreſſion of Homer, which is not accurate at this day, if applied to the ſpot I have deſcribed.

On the ſituation of the City, and of the monuments mentioned as exiſting previous to the war.

I have already mentioned ſome circumſtances relative to the ſituation of the city, about which indeed we find Homer extremely preciſe. We find in the firſt place that it was ſituated near the ſources of the Scamander,* at a diſtance from the ſhips, and in a part of the plain from which the whole of the Grecian † ſtation could not be properly reconnoitred; ſince Polites truſting to his ſkill in running, went for that purpoſe to the tomb of Æſyetes, for which there would otherwiſe have been no neceſſity. Speaking of its ſituation, ‡ he calls the town τροιη ηνεμοεσσα "the windy Troy," ſo that part of it was on a high, or at leaſt an expoſed ſituation. ‖ It was at no great diſtance from the Simois, and the beautiful hills of Callicolone. The city was built in the plain at the foot of Ida; but this by no means im-

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. xxii. ver. 208.—† Εκαθεν πολεως κοιλης επι νησι. Hom. Il. v. ver. 791.

‡ Hom. Il. ii. ver. 791.—‖ Hom. Il. xx. ver. 53.

plies that the Acropolis was not on an eminence; and that Troy had one, appears from the 6th Book, where the Trojan dames go to the Temple of Minerva εν πολει ακρη*; and alſo from the 8th Book of the Odyſſey, where the Trojans debate in the Acropolis, whether they ſhould deſtroy the Grecian horſe by precipitating it from the rocks, on which that citadel ſtood. The Scæan gate was near the ſources of the Scamander; it was alſo the gate towards the plain, through which the heroes always iſſued to the battle. Near it was the ερινεος, *the hill or place of wild fig trees*, † ενθα μακλισα Αμβατος εξι πολις ϗ επιδρομον επλετο τειχος, *whence the city was chiefly acceſſible, and the wall was on a level plain.* This will ſhew that though the city was εν πεδιω, the wall ſtood on uneven and ſloping ground, ſince this part of it only is mentioned as being επιδρομος, or where the foot of the wall was eaſily acceſſible. A ſituation in which all theſe characteriſtics ſhall agree, can hardly, I think, be conteſted by any one.

Before I draw the parallel, however, I will mention ſome other monuments, deſcribed by Homer, as exiſting prior to the events of the Iliad. Batieia, or the Sepulchre of Myrinna‡ was *a ſharp conical hill*, αιπεια κολωνη, and Homer therefore ſhews us what were the Sepulchres of the ancient heroic times. The tomb§ of Æſyetes we may expect, therefore, to have been a ſimilar cone, commanding the view of the coaſt, and at ſome diſtance from the city, yet not ſo as to be cut off from it by any part of the Greek army in the plain,

NOTES.

* Homer alſo calls the Citadel in another place "Περγαμω ακρη. the lofty Pergamus." Virgil after him mentions the "Priami Arx alta. the lofty Citadel of Priam." See alſo Hom. Il. vi. ver. 297. Odyſſey, viii. ver. 504, and ſeq.

† Hom. Il. vi. ver. 434.—‡ Hom. Il. ii. ver. 811.—§ Hom. Il. ii. ver. 793.

when

when drawn up on the banks of the Scamander, as in the 1ſt Book. This appears from Polites the ſon of Priam, being there as a ſcout to reconnoitre the naval ſtation of the Greeks.* He truſted to his fleetneſs, therefore he was not near the city, and was in a ſituation whence he could command a complete view of the lower part of the plain, uninterrupted by any intervening points or hills.

The only other monuments that I can find mentioned in Homer,† as exiſting previous to the Trojan war, and which might ſtill exiſt, are the tomb of Ilus, and the mound of the plain. The firſt was in the middle of the plain, that is, in the middle between the two ſides, for that it was nearer to the ſhips than to the city appears from the 8th Book. The Trojans encamped επι θρωσμω πεδιοιο cloſe to the mound ‡ of the plain, which was alſo not far diſtant from the Grecian army, as appears from Homer. Mr. Bryant,§ entering into a long controverſy, in order to tranſlate θρωσμος, *ſaltus*, a tract of foreſt land, obſerves that no army could encamp επι *upon* ſuch a mound as Chevalier deſcribes, but he muſt be aware ‖ that επι means "cloſe up to," as well as locally "upon." That this θρωσμος, or mound, was near the tomb of Ilus alſo appears, becauſe the Trojan council was held that night παρα σηματι Ιλυ,**

NOTES.

* Ποδωκείῃσι πεποιθὼς. Hom. Il. ii. ver. 792.

† Hom. Il. x. ver 414, and paſſim. alſo Il. x. 160. Ib. xi. 56. and 20. 3. and paſſim.

‡ This mound was near the ſhips. Hom. Il. x. ver. 160.

§ Mr. Bryant's Obſervations, &c. page 9.

‖ Επι πλαΐει Ελλησποντω, "On the ſhore of the Broad Helleſpont. Hom. Il. vii. ver. 86. Alſo επ' ηιονὶ Σκαμανδρω. Il. v. 36. "On the Banks of the Scamander."

** The tomb of Ilus was very near the ford of the Scamander, as Mercury meets Priam at that ford immediately after paſſing the tomb of Ilus. Hom. Il. ii. 3.

Νοσφιν απο * φλοισβου. Mr. Bryant,† very unfairly, in my opinion, tranſlates this "at the tomb of Ilus, *apart and at a diſtance from the noiſe of the camp.*" The words and meaning are "*apart from tumult*," that is, ſhut out from interruption, and not one word relative to diſtance. For a council to retire to a diſtance from an army in order to be free from noiſe, however common it may be in modern tactics, would I apprehend have hardly been deemed military by Hector or Agamemnon. I ſhall now proceed to deſcribe the actual ſtate of theſe ſituations, and ſhow how many of them may ſtill be traced in the plain I have deſcribed.

Returning then to the ſources of the ſpring at Bounarbachi, let us conſider the nature of the ground that riſes above them: A ſhort ſlope riſes on the eaſt, and Bounarbachi ſtands on the flat table land above it; this plain farther eaſt terminates at a deep dell, where the larger river (the Simois) enters the lower plain; on the ſouth eaſt a pointed and high hill riſes terminated on three ſides by high rocks, and the Simois rolls at the foot of theſe under a row of equally ſtupendous precipices on the oppoſite ſide. Now, aſſuming the propoſition that this place was Troy, let us draw the wall that defended it from precipice to precipice; we here then have the Acropolis ſurrounded by the rocks, down which one part of the council would have precipitated the wooden horſe; below, on the plain round Bounarbachi we ſhall have the city,

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. x. ver 415. Mr. Bryant ibid. page 9.

† In the eighth Book Hector withdraws his army and encamps νοσφιν *apart from* the ſhips. Hom. Il. l. viii. ver. 490. Yet while they remain in this poſition, Neſtor mentions them as being εγγυθι νηων, *near the ſhips*. l. ix. ver. 76. Therefore νοσφιν might be applied to a ſituation at no great diſtance, and Mr. Bryant's tranſlation is totally unwarranted.

which

which from its elevation above the lower plain would be πνεμοεσσα windy; the wall would on three ſides be defended by the precipices, and would then run along the brow of the ſlope below Bounarbachi; in the part immediately above the ſprings would be the Scæan gate, and the platform on which Bounarbachi ſtands extending thence towards the weſt, the wall would paſs from the top of the lower ſlope to the foot of the higher one that riſes towards the citadel, acroſs the ridge of a low hill, in that place level with the foot of the wall; this therefore being cloſe to the Scæan gate, in our ſuppoſed ſituation, anſwers in every reſpect to the place of wild fig trees, ερινεος, and as it runs out towards the plain, the Trojans would paſs it in running thence to the Scæan gate.* From this ſite being allotted to Troy, the reader looking at the map, will obſerve, that in viewing the ſhore from the platform of Bounarbachi, and even from the citadel, the eaſtern part of the plain is hid by the hills about Tchiblak and thoſe on the oppoſite ſide of the vale of Thimbrek; and this Homer tells us, by inference at leaſt, was the caſe with Troy. Now againſt ſo ſtrange and very extraordinary a coincidence of circumſtances can we ſuppoſe that Homer had not this ſituation in his mind when he deſcribed Troy?

But a ſtill farther proof ſtrengthens our conviction; in Strabo's time, beſides the tombs of Ajax, Achilles, and moſt of the other warriors, the tomb of Æſyetes, a monument of the higheſt antiquity, being mentioned by Homer as exiſting before the Trojan war, was ſhewn. Fortunately Strabo † informs us where to look for this tomb. It was ſeen in his

NOTES.

* Παξ' ερινεον σσσευονλο. Hom. Il. paſſim.—† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 599.

time on the road leading to Alexandria from modern Ilium. This was the road by which we entered the plain firſt, and a high conical barrow is erected upon a hill, immediately commanding, in the moſt advantageous point of view, the ſituation of Bounarbachi on the right, and the low part of the plain, the Helleſpont, and the naval ſtation, on the left. It is at a conſiderable diſtance from Bounarbachi, but not cut off from it by the plain between the rivers where the army was drawn up. This ſituation bears every mark of Æſyetes's tomb; it was called ſuch in the time of Demetrius of Scepſis, it alſo is αιπεια κολωνη* a pointed hill, a ſort of tomb uſual in that age, and exiſts ſtill to confirm Strabo and illuſtrate Homer. Of that of Myrinna there remain no traces, and the tomb of Ilus, which Chevalier marks in his map near the conflux of the rivers, was in that ſtate that it required, he ſays, as accurate an obſervation as he took of it to aſcertain its original form. In this there is, I think, a little imagination; for, though I am convinced that the tomb of Ilus was very near the place he allots it, yet I could not aſcertain its preciſe ſituation; there are unequal mounds in this part near the rivers, ſome of which may be the remains of ſuch a monument, but their appearance is, to me, by no means concluſive. The fact is that from their ſituations the tombs of Ilus and Myrinna have been much leſs likely to laſt than that of Æſyetes, ſince the ground near the monument of Ilus is marſhy and wet, and the ſepulchre of Myrinna† is deſcribed as ſtanding before the city, in the plain where the armies are drawn up. Local reaſons may therefore be aſſigned

NOTES.

* Chevalier on the Plain of Troy, page 24.

† The tomb of Myrinna was in the plain, περιδρομος ἔνθα κ᾽ ἔνθα, "acceſſible with eaſe on all ſides," therefore more likely to be effaced by the cauſes aſſigned. Hom. Il. ii. ver. 812.

for

for their diſappearance, and indeed after the days of their celebrity, in the conſtant cultivation of a fertile plain the labours of the plough would greatly contribute to deform and efface them. This we know happens for ever to monuments of this ſort, whilſt we ſee others as durable as the ground they ſtand on. At the diſtance of time in which Homer places the foundation of theſe, and the ſituation he allots them, theſe circumſtances need no apology; the wonder is that any thing remains.

I muſt here make one obſervation on an objection of Mr. Bryant's, on which he ſeems to lay conſiderable weight. He ſays, there were no traces of the City to be found, or any ancient memorial of its having ever exiſted. Lucan* deſcribing the time when Cæſar landed there, adds, "*etiam periere ruinæ*;" but as if it were not enough to mention ruins which, having periſhed, at leaſt muſt have exiſted; Cæſar we ſee recogniſed the ſituation, for he tells us the objects that had ſucceeded to this ſcene of ruin,

Jam † ſilvæ ſteriles, & putres robore trunci,
Aſſaraci preſſere domos & templa Deorum
Jam laſſa radice tenent: ac tota teguntur
Pergama dumetis.

His guide ſhows him alſo the Hercæan altars, and in the ſame ſentence adds, *Nullum eſt ſine nomine ſaxum:* No ſtone is without a name. "We know however of cities," ſays Mr. Bryant, "which have long been in a ſtate of ruin in Egypt, Paleſtine and Syria,‡ and other regions of the Eaſt. Pæſtum is

NOTES.

* Luc. Pharſ. l. ix. ver. 969.—† Luc. Pharſ. l. ix. ver. 966.
‡ Mr. Bryant on the War of Troy, page 44.

ſtill

ſtill viſited, and in our own country we have Verulam and Silcheſter." This is the ſame ſort of argument made uſe of with reſpect to the foſs and rampart. It does not prove any thing, for the queſtion here, is not whether any towns remain, but whether none have been deſtroyed. In this very plain the town of New Ilium,* which was once very conſiderable, is juſt as much obliterated as that of Troy: Abydos, which I alſo viſited, is in exactly the ſame ſtate, all that remains of it is a ſingle piece of wall not above ſix feet high and four feet long: Of Tyre, a city full as powerful, and much more lately deſtroyed, we have not a veſtige. But what was the ruin of any of theſe places (to which I could add many more) in compariſon with the ruin of Troy? An implacable and vindictive war of ten years, a general conflagration and pillage; the materials that compoſed it carried off by the towns near, to repair the ruins they had all ſuffered during the war; all cauſes that could promote ruin conſpiring with the ſilent lapſe of ages to do what time unaſſiſted has done to ſo many other places. But at laſt he adds, that "if every ſtone had been taken away, there would have remained inequalities in the ground, and to lay the ground plot ſmooth, was a work of labour." It was a labour that the plough would partly effect, and we are told *Seges eſt ubi Troja fuit.* Yet in the hill of Bounarbachi, traces of building and inequalities of ground do remain; and ſince Mr. Bryant has told us what he ſhould expect, he muſt acknowledge that Troy might exiſt here, for if he viſited the ſpot he would find his expectation anſwered. The ſituation aſſigned by M. Chevalier has evidently been built upon; the earth is cut into platforms, and when I conſidered that theſe

NOTE.

* New Ilium was adorned and largely added to by Alexander. See Strabo, l. xiii. p. 593.

were

were the foundations of ancient Troy, I wondered then that ſo much remained, though Mr. Bryant is diſappointed at finding ſo little.

On the form and ſituation of the tombs of thoſe warriors who fell during the war of Troy.

The heroes of the Grecian army, who are particularly mentioned as having fallen during the ſiege, are Achilles, Ajax, Patroclus, Antilochus, Peneleus and Proteſilaus; of the Trojans many were ſlain, Hector particularly and Paris. We find the tombs of moſt of theſe warriors celebrated by later writers, and attracting the attention and veneration of the neighbouring towns, and of many illuſtrious* viſitors. Alexander ſacrifices at Achilles's tomb; and the Thebans†, obeying the voice of the oracle, carry off the aſhes of Hector, and conſecrate them in a temple at Thebes. From Homer we may eaſily learn what was the nature of theſe monuments. The ſtructure ‡ Batieia, or the tomb of Myrinna was, we find, αιπεια κολωνη, *a high hill.* Homer alſo mentions the funeral ceremonies of Patroclus. § "They (the Greeks) marked out his tomb in a circle, and laid the foundation of it round the funeral pyre, and then threw upon it heaped earth; and, having thus heaped up the monument, returned." The monument therefore was made of heaped earth, and was circular. This was a Cenotaph; ‖ for Achilles gathered the bones of his friend into a golden vaſe, till his own ſhould be mixed with them. Achilles's tomb alſo was of the ſame nature, but larger; for, in the ſame ſpeech, after mention-

NOTES.

* Arrian, l. i. p. 32. Q. Curtius, l. ii. ch. 4.

† Pauſanias Bæotica. p. 295. l. 37. (Edit. Francofurti. A. D. 1585.)—‡ See above, p. 15.

§ Hom. Il. xxiii. ver. 255.—‖ Hom. Il. xxiii. ver. 243.

ing Patroclus's tomb, he adds, " afterwards, the Greeks* who ſhall be left in the ſhips at my death, will conſtruct one broader and loftier." This tomb of Patroclus was *on the ſhore*, επ' ακτης; and on the ſhore† of the *Thracian ſea*, by which the winds, that attended at the prayer of Achilles, returned. Of the tomb of Achilles, and the ſituation of it, we find a full deſcription in the Odyſſey.‡ " Around them" (that is, the aſhes of Achilles, Patroclus, and Antilochus) "the ſacred army of the warlike Greeks, threw up a large and honourable tomb on the ſounding ſhore of the broad Helleſpont, which appears far off to men at ſea, and ſhall appear to ſailors of future ages." That ſuch was the common ſituation of the tombs of the Greeks, appears from Hector's ſpeech,§ where he propoſes, in the conditions of ſingle combat, that, if he killed his adverſary, the body ſhould be returned, and that the Greeks ſhould raiſe a tomb to him on the ſhore of the broad Helleſpont. Another monument, mentioned by Homer with a great degree of particularity, is that of Hector. Having deſcribed the funeral, he ſays‖ " they put his urn into a hollow ſepulchre, and heaped it above with many large ſtones. Having heaped the tomb they retired." The other tombs we have deſcribed were therefore tombs of earth, that of Hector was heaped in the ſame manner, but was of ſtone: It was alſo near the city; for Priam orders the workmen to bring wood *to the city* ασυδε,** in order to make the pyre. Other particulars concerning theſe tombs, are mentioned in Strabo, and the later authors;

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. xxiii. ver. 246.

† " Hom. Il. xxiii. ver. 125.—‡ Hom. Odyſſ. xxiv. ver. 80.

§ Hom. Il. vii. ver. 86.—‖ Hom. Il. xxiv. ver. 797. and ſeq.—** Hom. Il. xxiv. ver. 778.

but

but theſe corroborations I defer for the preſent, my object being merely to ſhew that Homer's deſcriptions, as far as they go, agree accurately with the Plain.

Taking for granted, therefore, (what I have already ſhewn to be probable), that the naval ſtation of the Greeks was at the mouth of the Scamander; we know that Achilles's* ſtation was neareſt the Sigeum; for that is to be inferred from Homer's † placing him on the right wing of the army; and alſo that it was both near the ſhore of the Thracian ſea, and the mouth or outlet of the Helleſpont. When Achilles ‡ calls the winds to light Patroclus's pile, the two called are the north and weſt, and both return over the Thracian ſea; that ſea therefore, was to the north and weſt of the tomb, which was on the ſhore. This muſt and could only happen at the promontory, where the ſea really does flow on the north and weſt. It is here we muſt look for the tomb of Patroclus, and that of Achilles which was cloſe to it. The adjoined drawing is taken immediately off the Sigean promontory. At the foot of it the reader will obſerve two unequal tumuli at no great diſtance from the ſhore. From this point of view the Helleſpont ran up on our left; the Thracian Cherſoneſus, and the north part of the Ægean were behind us, and the expanſe of the ſea opened out on our right. Here then are two

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. viii. ver. 224. xi. ver. 7. and in l. xvii. l. 116. Ajax is repreſented as on the left of the army, therefore Achilles, who was at the other extremity, was on the right.

† This appears from the funeral of Patroclus, Il. xxiii. v. 255. and paſſim.

‡ Hom. Il. xxiii. ver. 194.

tumuli,

tumuli,* agreeing in ſhape, in number, in nature and ſituation with the two which Homer allots to Achilles, and Patroclus; and this agreement is found in circumſtances of ſo detailed an accuracy, that it is impoſſible in deſcribing theſe tumuli, to add, or take away any thing from his deſcription of the tombs. Either theſe tombs, and this plain were the objects of that deſcription, or their coincidence is a miracle far beyond what we can account for.

The ſtation of Ajax † was on the left wing, and oppoſite that of Achilles; that is to ſay, it was neareſt to what was afterwards called the Rhetean promontory. Where his tomb was, Homer does not tell us; but we find that he was one of the heroes who were buried in the plain; for Neſtor mentions him as buried there along with Achilles,‡ Patroclus, and Antilochus. His tomb was afterwards worſhipped by the § Rheteans, and was ſhewn near their town. A circular chapel was built upon it, and it long continued the object of veneration. About three miles and a half from Sigæum, on a low hill, there now exiſts a tumulus of the ſame nature as thoſe of Achilles and Patroclus; ſuch as are in every inſtance deſcribed by Homer. Antony, ‖ or Pompey, it is thought, plundered the tomb of Ajax of its aſhes, and carried them to Egypt. That it was opened, however, we find in Pauſanias.** His words are theſe; "a certain

NOTES.

* Chevalier aſſerts that the tumulus of Achilles is at this day called Διος-ταπη Dios-tapé, the "divine tomb," but beſides that Dios is not a word uſed by the modern Greeks, it appears to be a miſtake. The two tumuli are called Δυω-ταπη, which is of nearly the ſame pronunciation now, and means no more than *the two hills*.

† Hom. Il. loc. ſupracit. See note on page 23. l. xi.—‡ Hom. Odyſſ. iii. ver. 109.

§ Pauſan. Attic. p. 33, 34. Strabo, l. xiii. p. 595.—‖ See Chevalier on the Plain, &c. p. 108.

** Pauſan. l. i. p. 34, 36. (Edit. Francof. A. D. 1583.)

Myſian

Myſian told me that the ſea had waſhed open that part which was next the ſhore, and that the entrance into the tomb was now not difficult." On the tumulus which I have juſt deſcribed, we firſt obſerved remains of circular walls near the top; and on the weſt ſide, which is now over a large marſh, (where the ſea probably was, in the time of Pauſanias,) the ſide of the barrow has fallen away, and the mouth of a vault is diſcovered; it is of the rudeſt and earlieſt maſonry; a croſs vault is at the end of this, and in the center of the tumulus, but the earth had nearly choaked it up. This form of the inſide is a ſure proof that it was a ſepulchre, for ſuch is the ſtructure of almoſt all the ancient tombs ſtill ſeen near their cities in Greece and Aſia. Whether this ſepulchre was that of Ajax, Mr. Bryant may doubt, but we are ſure that it was the ſame which Pauſanias and the Rheteans believed to be ſuch; and againſt the evidence of all antiquity we have nothing that tends to a negative. Other tombs are viewed along the coaſt of the Helleſpont, but we have not data ſufficient to aſcertain the owners of each. That Patroclus though buried with Achilles, had a cenotaph we have already ſeen; but whether Antilochus had one or not we do not know; there is nothing abſurd however in ſuppoſing it, and yet I own I think thoſe who affix the names of Antilochus and Peneleus to the other barrows,* are rather to be reſpected for an ingenious conjecture than abſolutely relied on for facts. They all are ſituated on the ſhore, and appear far out at ſea, thus uniting every characteriſtic of the tombs of Grecian heroes.

Returning to the hills behind Bounarbachi, we find, on the ſummit of the higheſt, three tombs exactly ſimilar to thoſe on the

NOTE.

* See Dr. Chandler, Pocock, Mr. Chevalier, &c.

ſhore; a fourth is ſimilar in ſhape, but compoſed in a great meaſure of heaped ſtones. One ſide of it is injured, and appears to have been opened: In this ſhort deſcription do we not recognize the characteriſtics of the ſepulchre of Hector, as deſcribed by Homer? and the more ſince we are told that this tomb was opened by the Thebans,* who in obedience to the Oracle carried off his aſhes to their own city. Theſe tombs are near the Acropolis, they are as viſible as thoſe on the ſhore, and are ſeen from moſt parts of the plain below. Another proof that the Trojan warriors were ſo buried, appears from the epitaph on Paris preſerved by Ariſtotle, who mentions his tomb as ſituated on the ſummit of the hills.† What conjectural proofs can overturn a demonſtration ſtrong as that which ariſes from theſe coincidences?

I have hitherto purpoſely avoided mentioning the antiquities ‡ found by the Duc de Choiſeul in the tomb of Achilles; they were much mutilated, and in conſequence, ſo many vague conjectures were made, that ſince I had not an opportunity of ſeeing them, I dare not hazard an account, which I have heard contradicted. Every one agrees, however, that charcoal and bones were found there; an ample proof that it was a place of burial. When in the country, I attempted repeatedly to obtain permiſſion of digging in different parts of the plain; but as I was not authoriſed by the Porte itſelf, the Agas, who always ſuſpected that we wiſhed to look for treaſure, were too ignorant and too fearful to permit us.

NOTES.

* Pauſanias Bæotica. p. 567. Edit. Hanov.—† Ariſtotelis Pepli Fragmentum; Epitaph 54.

‡ See Chevalier, Dallaway's Ancient and Modern Conſtantinople, &c.

However

However Mr. Bryant, unconvinced by this coincidence, boldly ſays, that theſe were all Thracian barrows founded before the æra of Troy, appropriated by the Grecians long afterwards to the names of their heroes; and why? " * becauſe ſuch barrows are alſo found in Thrace." One of theſe is aſcribed to Porteſilaus, and another to Hecuba. Certainly upon the Cynoſſema there is a barrow ſimilar to all the reſt, which may be that of Hecuba. This barrow ſtands above the European caſtle of the Dardanelles, and that this hill was the Cynoſſema we learn from Strabo, who places it weſt of Seſtos, near Madytos and Koilos.† The two laſt towns ſtill remain and are called Maita and Koilia. Many other barrows are ſeen in Thrace, Aſia and Greece.‡ The Thracians coloniſed Phrygia, but the Thracians were Greek, witneſs the Greek of Orpheus, Muſæus, Linus, and Thamyris. The heroic ages every where have conformed to the cuſtom of burying in barrows. Pauſanias mentions ſeveral in Greece and Aſia, and I ſpeak from my own knowledge when I declare he ſcarce ever mentions a tomb § of the heroic times, where a barrow

NOTES.

* Mr. Bryant's "Obſervations on a Treatiſe," &c. page 39.

† Mela alſo places (Koilos) Cælus between Seſtos and the Cynos-ſema. De ſitâ Orb. l. ii. ch. 2. p. 67. (Leyden Edit.) 12mo. 1646.

‡ See Strabo. l. x. p. 471. Note on page 39, of this work, ſee alſo page 40.

§ Amongſt the tombs of this time mentioned by Pauſanias, and ſtill remaining, I cannot help taking notice of ſome of the moſt particular. The firſt is that of Antiope the Amazon, whoſe ſtory is told us by Pauſanias, and whoſe tomb was ſhewn in the road to Athens from Phalerus. Theſe ſituations are known, and a barrow is found there. It was opened by Monſieur Fauvel, a French painter, employed in that country, by the Duc de Choiſeul, late Ambaſſador from France to the Porte. He aſſured me that aſhes and charcoal were found in it, and he had preſerved a ſmall vaſe of the ſame ſpecies with thoſe called Etruſcan: the workmanſhip of this was particularly curious: the vaſe was a glazed white, and ſome figures of very rude drawing were delineated on it; the outlines only marked in red. The nature of the vaſe, and the ſtile of the work both gave ſtrong evidence of the infancy of the arts, and of the extreme antiquity of the vaſe. He gives us alſo the hiſtory of Auge, a daughter of Aleus, who was violated by Hercules.

She

barrow does not ſtill exiſt. That the hiſtory of thoſe in Thrace ſhould be loſt as well as that of our own Druidical tumuli, is no wonder; but if any one now in England, was to give each of them the names of people who lived within a century or two, he would be laughed at or pitied, but certainly not followed.* Homer lived within a little time of the war of Troy; would he hazard ſo abſurd an application? This is a preſumption in favour of the Grecian ſtory, in which there is united the uniform concurrence of every age againſt Mr. Bryant's unſupported conjecture. The reader will chuſe between them.

On the agreement of the Plain, with the events of the Iliad.

To an attentive reader of Homer, the Map prefixed to the ſecond part of this work, will be very ſatisfactory. Chevalier † in his treatiſe had ſhewn how well it agreed with Homer's battles, as detailed in the eſſay on that ſubject by the ingenious friend of Pope. On reading the Iliad, other circumſtances of topography occur for ever; and I have obſerved with pleaſure that not an event is mentioned there, for which a place might not be aſſigned with

NOTES.

She afterwards lived at Pergamus, and was beloved by Teuthras, the King of the Country, and ſtill, he ſays, her tomb is ſeen at that city, near the Caicus, (γῆς χῶμα λίθου περι ἐχομενον κρηπῖδι.) a mound of earth, girt with a breaſt work of ſtone. Such a mound is ſeen now in the very ſame ſituation, and is breaſted by a high wall of enormous diamond cut ſtone, ſimilar in maſonry to the walls of Mycenæ, and, like them, evidently a work of the moſt remote antiquity. The two tombs of Eurytos and Cteatus, are ſtill ſeen at Cleonæ, and that of Minyas at Orchomenos. I could mention many more, but theſe will convince the reader of the accuracy of Pauſanias, and will ſhew what were the tombs of the heroic ages, in the opinion of Grecian antiquarians. See Pauſanias Athe. p. 2. Arcad. p. 239. Corinthian. p. 57. Bæotic. p. 311.

* For inſtance, the names of Henry VIII. Edward VI. or Queen Elizabeth; or take it higher, even to William the Conqueror, the impoſture would not be borne.

† See Chevalier on the Plain of Troy, p. 81. Eſſay on Homer's battles in Pope's Iliad, 2d vol.

probability

probability in the Plain of Bounarbachi. A recapitulation of the Iliad would be here unneceſſary, and the reader may eaſily convince himſelf of the truth of the aſſertion, by turning to the Poem. The events there deſcribed coincide completely with the map of the Plain at this day; except in the diſtance of Troy from the ſhore, which, as the plain now ſtands, or rather as Mr. Bryant* makes Chevalier ſtate it, does certainly not admit of the events of the day on which Patroclus died. M. Chevalier calls the diſtance from Bounarbachi to the ſea four leagues, which Mr. Bryant interprets twelve miles, and then adds a mile to the citadel, which certainly had nothing to do with events which took place between the Scæan gate and the ſhips; and the ingenious traveller places that gate below Bounarbachi near the ſources of the Scamander. Beſides this M. Chevalier in giving this ſtatement of four leagues, conforms only to the rough local computation of four Ωραι or hours from Bounarbachi to Jenichehr: Each of theſe conſiſt of three Turkiſh or Italian miles, which are but little more than two miles Engliſh; and when we come to examine the map where there is a ſcale of Engliſh miles, we find that the diſtance from the ſources of the Scamander to the Sigæan is there laid down as about nine miles and a half, and indeed this is nearly conſonant to the truth.

Another circumſtance which M. Chevalier takes notice of is, a conſiderable accretion of land at the mouth of the Simois, for a proof of which my reader need only look at the drawing of that part of the Plain:† the long low points of flat marſhy ground run-

NOTES.

* Mr. Bryant's "Obſervations on a Treatiſe, &c." page 1, 2.

† See Strabo, l. xiii. p. 595. Polybius, l. iv. p. 12.

ning forward into the ſea ſufficiently evince their origin; and the Simois has this property in common with every river in the country.

We know that formerly the Sigæum and * Rheteum formed a bay, and (notwithſtanding Mr. Bryant's doubts about the ſituation of the latter) I ſhall endeavour to prove that it was where Chevalier places it. Strabo † ſays expreſsly, that it was contiguous to the tomb of Ajax, and that tomb is, as I have ſhewn, fully aſcertained. It is true he ſtates the meaſurement from promontory to promontory inaccurately, but Pliny rectifies it and agrees perfectly with M. Chevalier. When Solinus ‡ repreſents it as forty ſtadia, the difference probably aroſe from the meaſure of the ſtadium. It is alſo evident that before the accretion of land in the Plain, this ſhore formed a Bay. Drawing then a line ſo as ſtill to make it one, we ſhall find that from the Scæan gate to the mouth of the united rivers, was probably not more than ſeven or eight miles. If we conſider alſo how much of this ſpace § was occupied by the armies, when drawn up in the Plain we ſhall not think it ſo very hyperbolical, that large bodies of men ſhould at one time be fighting near the ſhips, and at another almoſt up to the town. Moſt of the heroes alſo are repreſented as chacing the enemies about the Plain in chariots, and I will add that a leſs ſpace than that which is here allotted will hardly be ſufficient for the various manœuvres which Homer recounts, if

NOTES.

* Mr. Bryant's "Obſervations on a Treatiſe, &c." p. 4.—† Strabo. loc. ſuprac.

‡ Plin. Hiſtor. Natur. l. v. ch. 33.

§ It muſt be obſerved that the diſtance from the city to the antient confluence was probably about ſeven miles, and from thence to the ſhore, was in Homer's time only about ſix ſtadia, according to Strabo. Strabo, l. xiii. p. 598.

we only conſider the numbers of each army. Hector,* it ſeems, ſent after the battle, on the day preceding the death of Patroclus, for proviſions from Troy, and kept his army under arms in the Plain; ſuppoſing Troy then to have been at ſix or ſeven miles diſtance, it is very poſſible that the proviſions would arrive in three or four hours; but if Troy had been much nearer to the Grecian tents, the encampment of the Trojan army would have been very uſeleſs, as the town would have commanded the naval ſtation nearly as well. Strabo gives his whole account from Demetrius, and with reſpect to the poſitive ſituation of Troy, is never therefore a deciſive authority. He doubts ſome of the facts, which he relates from hear-ſay, and is in contradiction repeatedly with Pliny and other reſpectable authorities. But the ſprings of the Scamander are ſo plainly pointed out; the ground-plan of the city, and the rocks of the Acropolis afford ſuch deciſive proof of the ſituation of Troy; that when in addition to theſe facts I conſider the marks of building ſtill ſeen in the form of the hill, I can entertain no reaſonable doubt but that this was the ſituation alluded to by Homer.

Much has alſo been ſaid on the poſition of the camp. Chevalier and others make the Sigæan and Rhetean promontories the boundaries of their camp, thus confounding the ſtations of Achilles and Ajax with the ſituation of their tombs. That the tomb of the firſt was not far from his ſtation, we know from the Odyſſey.† Suppoſing, therefore, the camp on this ſide to be flanked with the promontory under which his tomb is ſeen, it is probable that the mouth of the river formed the other boundary;

NOTES.

* Hom. Il. viii. ver. 505.—† Hom. Odyſſ. 24. ver. 80.

and

and this will account for the ſtraitneſs * of the Grecian quarters ſince the ſhips could not all be drawn along the ſhore in one line, and Agamemnon's voice might be almoſt heard from the centre to the two extremities. Indeed we find that the allies of the Trojans were in the night encamped παρ' ἅλος on the ſea ſhore, but this could not happen if the Grecian camp occupied the whole of it; the junction of the rivers and the tomb of Ilus were very near the camp, ſo near that the Grecians could hear the noiſes from Hector's poſition, when he kept his men under arms in the Plain. This ſuppoſition alſo obviates an objection of Mr. Bryant's with regard to the Simois and † Scamander running through the camp; but indeed the rivers are of that nature, that there is no occaſion to have recourſe to ſuch an expedient.

On the topography of the Plain, as deſcribed by the later writers of antiquity.

If in addition to the teſtimony of Homer we examine the collateral evidence of other ancient writers, it will ſeem to ſtrengthen his authority, and will completely ſhew the accuracy of the adjoined map. Pliny ‡ coming from the ſouth along the coaſt, arrives at Alexandria, then at Nee, "then at Scamander a navigable ſtream, and then at Sigeum a town on the Sigæan promontory, then at the port of the Grecians, into which flowed Xanthus joined with the Simois, making firſt a marſh, and now called

NOTES.

* This is a conjecture it will be ſaid; be it ſo, if it is uncontradicted by Homer, and if the ſuppoſitions that make the camp of greater extent are not equally favourable to his account, the conjecture will at leaſt ſhew the poſſibility of his being accurate, and will obviate the objection ariſing from ſuch inconſiſtency.

† Bryant's "Obſervations on a Treatiſe, &c." p. 6, 7.

‡ Plinii Natur. Hiſt. l. v. cap. 30. Troadis primus locus Hamaxitus dein Cebrenia, ipſaque Troas, Antigonia dicta, nunc Alexandria, Colonia Romanorum, oppidum Nee, Scamander *amnis navigabilis*, & in promontorio quondam Sigæum oppidum. Dein portus Achæorum in quem influit Xanthus Simoenti junctus, Stagnumque prius faciens Palæ-Scamander, &c.

the

the Old Scamander; beyond this creek are the ſhores of Rheteum, then Rheteum, Dardanus, and Ariſba." We find therefore that the new and old channel of the Scamander were known to Pliny, and that the new channel was navigated, which will account for its formation; and it probably was uſed near its mouth as a canal from New Ilium or Sigæum to that part of the ſhore.

Ptolemy, who does not mention the new channel of the Scamander, mentions theſe places in the following order, and is alſo thus quoted by Mr. Bryant himſelf; coming from the north he enumerates Dardanum, Simoeis, Scamander, Sigæum, *Alexandria, Lectum; but theſe correſpond preciſely with our deſcription; and indeed we ſhall find that all the difference between ancient authors aroſe from the new mouth of the Scamander, and that this ſingle circumſtance cleared up, all the obſcurity is removed.

By Strabo, that is by Strabo's informer, the Scamander of Homer ſeems not to have been known, and indeed this is to be accounted for in the ſame manner; ſince prepoſſeſſed with the idea, that the Simois and Scamander of Homer muſt unite their waters, he purſued the greater ſtream into the mountains, and then from its name at the mouth, concluded this the Scamander,† and calls it ſo, notwithſtanding he owns that it had not the characteriſtics mentioned in Homer. Notwithſtanding this, at other times Strabo places the Scamander and Simois both in the Plain;‡ and ſeems as if he conſidered the leſſer ſtream to be the Simois. Indeed he makes the two rivers join near New Ilium, and no ſtreams but

NOTES.

* Ptolemy Geog. p. 137. Bryant's Obſervations, &c. p. 31.

† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 602.—‡ Strabo, l. xiii. p. 597, 598.

thoſe here deſcribed, can be meant by Strabo in this paſſage. The confuſion reſulting from this is inextricable, and ſhews plainly that he had not been there in perſon. But we find that in his days moſt of the monuments of Homer ſtill exiſted, and were pointed out in this Plain ;* the Erineos or place of wild fig-trees, the Sepulchres of Æſyetes, Batieia, and Ilus. The Callicolone alſo was ſeen in his time, and retained its name. The naval ſtation, *Nauſtathmus*, was ſhewn alſo; and he argues from its ſituation, with great juſtice, that New Ilium was not on the ſite of ancient Troy. We may alſo learn the ſtate of the Plain from another paſſage. He ſays New Ilium was near the conflux of the rivers, and in his time twelve ſtadia diſtant from the ſea. The conflux is now at a much greater diſtance, and Strabo† adds, that of theſe twelve ſtadia, we ought to deduct half; ſince the whole of this part of the Plain is formed by the rivers; ſo that it ſeems the diſtance of the conflux from the ſhore is eſtimated by Strabo,‡ at ſix ſtadia in the time of Homer, and it is now about ſixteen or ſeventeen. He alſo mentions the tomb and temple of Ajax, near the Rhetean promontory on the edge of a ſandy ſhore. The ſepulchre of Achilles and temple in honour of him were ſituated on the Sigæan ;§ alſo the monuments of Antilochus and Patroclus; at which ſhrines the Ilians ſacrificed. Strabo alſo ſeems to have been miſled by the confuſion which the new mouth of the Scamander occaſioned; for in the ſurvey of the coaſt he mentions Sigæum‖ next to Rheteum, and then the naval ſtation, and the camp of the Greeks, the Stoma limne, and mouth

NOTES.

* Strabo, l. xiii. p. 597, 598.—† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 598.—‡ Strabo, l. xiii. p. 595.

§ Strabo, l. xiii. p. 595, 596.—‖ Ibid ibidem.

of

of the Scàmander. But all theſe objects were between the two promontories, and the miſtake has ariſen from the mouth of Scamander being changed, and Strabo not being ſo well informed as Pliny of the diſtinction of the Old and New Scamander (Palæ Scamander). In another place, however, he ſeems to have been better informed of the ſituation of the Plain. "For," ſays he, "the Simois and Scamander forming a junction *in the Plain*, bring down a quantity of mud, and heap up the ſhore, &c.—But the length of *this ſhore* (της παραλιας ταυλης) from the Rhetean to the Sigæan promontory is ſixty ſtadia." In this paſſage Strabo evidently places the confluence and the mouth of the two rivers between the promontories mentioned. Here then Strabo is directly contrary to the hypotheſis which I combat; and the paſſage is perfectly correſpondent to the geography of the Plain of Bournabachi. The paſſage in which the places along the coaſt are mentioned, is poſſibly corrupted therefore by tranſcribers, and indeed few ancient authors have been handed down to us in a more imperfect condition than Strabo.

At the mouth of the Old Scamander, Pliny informs us that a ſmall village ſtood called Scamandria, * which had a port; and Ilium immune or New Ilium ſtood a Roman mile and a half higher up, that is, as near as can be, twelve ſtadia. Here then we have a confirmation of Strabo, who ſays that New Ilium was exactly twelve ſtadia from the ſhore in his time; being near the conflux of the rivers, as we have ſeen above; and to this town Scamandria was probably a kind of harbour. Strabo, therefore by no

NOTE.

* Pliny Natur. Hiſt. Eſt tamen et nunc Scamandria civitas parva, & 1500 paſſ. remotum a portu Ilium immune.

means

means miſtook Scamandria for New Ilium, as has been ſaid by ſome.* Nor did Pliny authoriſe us to conſider his New Ilium, as the ſame with Strabo's *Pagus Ilienſium*, which he places at thirty ſtadia or about three miles and a half higher ſtill. Here Strabo† imagined Troy might be found, but there is nothing in the Plain that can favour ſuch a ſuppoſition, and his means of judging were defective, ſince he only ſpeaks from hearſay.

So far the geographers inform us concerning the ſituation and ſtate of the Plain in their time. In former ages we find it alſo mentioned by the hiſtorians; and firſt in Herodotus.‡ In the route by which the army of Xerxes marched to Abydos, is included the Troad. There is a paſſage in this author which has much perplexed Mr. Chevalier; he ſays Xerxes marching from Antandros, paſſed Mount Ida on the left hand ἐς ἀριστερὴν χείρα, which Mr. Chevalier would willingly tranſlate "on the left branch of the mountain," but the words will ſcarcely bear that interpretation. Mr. Bryant remarks very juſtly, that according to Homer, Gargarus was the Ida κατ' ἐξοχην, and this was the name of it in Herodotus; it was conſidered as the ſummit of Ida, and therefore whoever paſſed it on the left hand, paſſed Ida on the left. Such was the route of Xerxes.§ When the army arrived at the Scamander, having not met

NOTES.

* See a Review of Mr. Bryant's publication. Britiſh Critic, No. 50.

† Strabo, l. xiii. p. 597.

‡ Herod. l. v. cap. 93. l. vii. cap. 42. quoted in Chevalier's Deſcription, &c. p. 42.

§ Ἐπὶ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν πόλεμον ὡς ἀφίκετο Ξέρξης ἐς τὸ Πριάμε Πέργαμον ἀνέβη ἵμερον ἔχων θεήσασθαι. θεησάμενος δὲ καὶ πυθόμενος κείνων ἕκαστα, τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ τῇ Ἰλιάδῃ ἔθυσε βοῦς χιλίας. χοὰς δὲ οἱ μάγοι τοῖσι ἥρωσι ἐχέαντο. Herod. vii. 42. Xerxes aſcended from the Scamander to the Pergamus of Priam; he there ſacrificed to Minerva Ilias, and to the manes of the heroes. The Pergamus of Priam,

------ So far the Geographical [illegible] the
the situation & state of the plain in their time.

in former ages we find it also mentioned by the
Historians, & first in Herodotus L V cap 93 L VII cap 42
quoted in Chevalier's description page 42.

in the route by which the army of Xerxes marched
from ~~on~~ to Abydos is included the Troad.

there is a passage in this author which has
much ~~puzzled~~ perplexed M. Chevalier. he says! Xerxes
marching from Antandros passed Mount ~~Ida~~ Ida on
the Left hand ἐς ἀριστερὴν χεῖρα which M. Chevalier
would willingly translate ἐ on the left branch of the Mountain
mountain, but the words will scarcely bear that
interpretation — M. Bryant remarks very justly, that
according to Homer, Gargarus was the Ida par excellence.
~~Ἐστι~~ ἐξοχὴν & this was the name of it in Herodotus,
& therefore Whoever passed it on the Left hand
passed Ida on the left. Such was the ~~Course~~ route
of Xerxes

When the army arrived at the Scamander having
not met with a River since they Left Sardes, the exhausted
in Stream which did not suffice to the Man & ~~Cattle~~ Cattle.
this shews the size of it and also the nature
for they did not drink at Simois which was a muddy
troubled torrent.

Xerxes being come to that river ascended
to ~~the~~ Pergamus of Priam to view the place.
when the army marched away they Left
Rhoeteum Ophrinium & Dardanus, on their Left and the
Gergethes & Teucry on their right, idest Inland. Thus
Quotation I have mentioned though given in Chevalier
Since the route I have marked out appears to me
to agree entirely with that of a person coming from
from Antandros & obviates the objections arising from
the Situation of Ida

met with a river ſince they left Sardes, they *exhauſted its ſtream*, which did not ſuffice to the men and cattle; this ſhews the ſize of it, and alſo the nature, for they did not drink at Simois, which was a muddy troubled torrent. Xerxes being come to that river, *aſcended* to the Pergamus of Priam to view the place. When the army marched away, they left Rheteum, Ophryneum, and Dardanus, on their left, and the Gergethes and Teucri on their right; i.e. inland. This quotation I have mentioned, though given in Chevalier, ſince the route I have marked out, appears to me to agree entirely with that of a perſon coming from Antandros, and obviates the objection ariſing from the ſituation of Ida.

The viſit paid by Alexander to the tombs is related by Freinſhemius in his appendix to Q. Curtius,* who tranſcribed it originally from Arrian. This account is given us with great detail in the work of Chevalier. Q. Curtius himſelf abridges it, for he ſays, that Alexander,† having offered ſeveral different ſacrifices, more particularly venerated the tomb of Achilles, and declared him the happieſt of men, who had ſuch a poet as Homer to celebrate his praiſes. Lucan‡ makes Cæſar penetrate into the Troad, but this fact is not mentioned in his own Commentaries; the authority of the poet is therefore

NOTES.

Priam was different from the New Ilium which never went by that name. Did another Pergamus exiſt in Egypt? or where are we to look for it, if not where Xerxes found it on the banks of the Scamander? It was then under the protection of Minerva Ilias; a ſtrong ſuggeſtion that this fortreſs was once Ilium; and it is incumbent alſo on Mr. Bryant to prove that Minerva was imported here after the Trojan war, ſince he will not allow her to have been at that time a Deity of Phrygia.

* Arrian. l. p. 32. Alexander alſo ſacrificed Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ, Ιλιαδι "to the Ilian Minerva," to Priam, and to Achilles whoſe tomb he crowned.

† Q. Curt. l. ii. ch. 4.—‡ Lucan Pharſal. l. ix. ver. 960 et ſeq.

doubtful, but it tends at leaſt to ſhew Lucan's opinions on this ſubject. His deſcription of the Plain I have already ſet down at length. All theſe accounts, and many other leſs important, appear in the ſtrongeſt manner to confirm the identity of the Plain, and of the monuments found in it. That they agree with Homer's account has been ſhewn in the foregoing parts of this work. We here ſee that all the Geographers of Antiquity who have come down to us, agree alſo as much as we can expect; and that we can account for the difference that has ariſen amongſt them from particular local circumſtances, which therefore corroborate their accounts in general. Other quotations are cited by Chevalier already, and ſtill more might be collected, but thoſe I have ſet down are ſufficient to prove the facts, and are unſhaken by any contradictory teſtimony.

Recapitulation.

Having in the firſt part of this work endeavoured to prove the poſſibility of Homer's two poems, containing hiſtorical facts, I have proceeded in the ſecond part to prove, that they really did ſo. I have ſhewn that Homer gives a very detailed account of the ſituation of the Plain of Troy, and both from M. Chevalier's work, and the teſtimony of what I myſelf have ſeen, have ſhewn that there is a Plain in that ſituation, and that no other exiſts which can have the ſhadow of a claim to rivality. I have ſhewn many circumſtances illuſtrative of the nature of the Plain, and alſo that it had two rivers which are rather particularly deſcribed; and that in theſe circumſtances the ſituation I had aſſigned is exactly ſuch as previous to the finding it we ſhould have expected to find from the account given us in Homer. I have ſhewn that Homer mentions ſeveral objects as exiſting before the Trojan war, as well as the city of Troy; that the ſituations of theſe are very minutely deſcribed,

and

and that in this Plain there are ſituations which agree with them in the moſt minute particulars, and that traces of many of them are to be ſeen at this day; the form and ſituation of the tombs of ſome of the heroes are mentioned by Homer, and it is mentioned that there were others of which the topography is not particularized. Tombs of that form we ſee do ſtill remain in this plain, and where Homer has ſpecified the place we there find them; we alſo find others which are not ſpecified. Referring to a map of the Plain, we find that the battles and events recorded by Homer, have every where an aſſignable place in it. And laſtly, to the teſtimony of Homer I have added that of ſome of the ancient Geographers and Hiſtorians of the greateſt credit, and have ſhewn that their teſtimonies uniformly coincide with his, and that their differences ariſe from a real change in the topography of this plain, which therefore was certainly the ſituation where they all ſought for the traces of the Iliad. The inference from hence, is therefore, either that the events recorded did really happen, or that Homer adapted the whole of his hiſtory with the greateſt accuracy, to a real ſcene. That the latter was not the caſe is what I ſhall endeavour to prove in the few pages which remain.

Proofs from the internal evidence of the Iliad, and from the authority of ancient writers, in favour of the reality of the ſtory.

As I have already ſhewn that we have no rational ground to diſbelieve the ſtory of the Iliad, ſo in many parts of the foregoing work I have hinted at the reaſons we have for ranking it with hiſtory. Turning back to Mr. Bryant's firſt chapter, I will repeat his own conceſſions: "In the deſcription of the ſiege and of the great events with which it was attended, the poet," (ſays he) "is very particular and preciſe. The ſituation of the city is pointed out as well as the camp of the Grecians, &c. &c. ſo that the very landſcape preſents itſelf to the eye of the reader. *Hence the whole ſeems attended with the greateſt appearance of truth.* The poet alſo

alſo in many parts of this work, introduces incidentally, paſt events as well known. He alludes to the arrival of Memnon, and to the death of his father Antilochus by that hero. He ſpeaks of Pyrrhus as ſucceeding to Achilles, &c. &c. All theſe caſual references ſeem to have been portions of a traditional hiſtory, well known in the time of Homer, and as they are introduced almoſt undeſignedly, they are attended with a great ſemblance of truth. For ſuch incidental and partial intimations are ſeldom to be found in romance or fable."

Having ſhewn the futility of all Mr. Bryant's objections, and by conſequence the reaſonableneſs of theſe conceſſions, the inference from them will follow of courſe. But the air of truth with which the Iliad is written, is by no means the only proof of its veracity. When we examine the different traditions preſerved to us by other Authors, we find a great many varying accounts of theſe times, evidently independent of Homer and of each other; ſome containing additional circumſtances, and ſome contradicting different parts of his narration. All of them, however, agree in the general outline, and their difference ariſes from a portion of them being conſigned to futurity by the authentic and unaltered writings of Homer, and the reſt being handed down to the later ages of Greece by uncertain and varying traditions. Of theſe traditions I have mentioned two or three; one was found by Herodotus,* recorded as a well-known fact in Mr. Bryant's favourite ſeminaries, the colleges of the Egyptian Prieſts; Strabo† informs us of another which prevailed among the people of

NOTES.

* Herod. l. 2. ch. 117.– † Strabo, l. xiii. p. 607.

Scepſis.

Scepſis. In the firſt chapter of Herodotus,* we find another prevalent amongſt the Perſians, and the people of Aſia, who dated their hoſtility to the Greeks from this event, and give an account of prior tranſactions repreſenting the Greeks as the aggreſſors. Of the Grecian traditions I take no notice ;† their altars to the heroes, their local memorials, their feſtivals and games alluſive to the war of Troy, would fill a volume, and are too well known to require illuſtration here. Add to theſe, the united teſtimony of Aſia and Egypt ; where Herodotus in perſon was made acquainted with this part of their annals ; and it muſt be owned, that no hiſtorical event was ever ſupported by a ſtronger concurrence of traditional evidence.

Let us next recollect the ſucceſſion of events which took place before, during, and after the war of Troy; and we ſhall find that together with Homer, Mr. Bryant's hypotheſis annihilates the whole of the early hiſtory of Greece. Before the war we are acquainted with moſt of the heroes, their birth, deſcent, and intermarriages : Thus Agamemnon and Menelaus marry two ſiſters, the daughters of Tyndarus, and rule over Mycenæ and Sparta. Ulyſſes marries Penelope the daughter of Icarius ; and traditions, and monuments relative to theſe facts, and a hundred ſimilar to them, were found in the country of Sparta, Ithaca, and Argolis. We know independent of the ſiege the private hiſtory of all the great families of Greece during this time ; many of theſe are ſlightly alluded to by Homer, and are preſerved by other Authors. Thus, Clytemneſtra and Ægiale plotted againſt their huſbands during their abſence ; Penelope and

NOTES.

* Herod. l. i. c. 1.—† See Pauſanias, &c. paſſim.

Telemachus were oppreſſed by enemies till the return of Ulyſſes; Pyrrhus was educated at Scyros by his mother's father, till he ſucceeded to the command and honours of Achilles; and different ſtories of this ſort all connected with the Iliad, and preſerved by other means, ſhew that it contains only a few links of the great chain of events, which Homer's hands have preſerved from the ruſt that covers the reſt. After the Iliad, we know the lot of the heroes,* we know the conduct of their wives and children: Greece weakened by her dear-earned victory, and torn by internal diſſentions, ſaw all her thrones overturned by the return of the Heraclidæ. Thus we have at once a regular ſeries of events, of which no part can be annihilated without affecting the credibility of the whole of hiſtory, and the united teſtimony of the ancient world.

To theſe evidences I will only add the almoſt univerſal concurrence of the ancient Authors, to whom I place references at the end of this work. We find almoſt every poet from Heſiod downward, mentioning this event; we find it recorded in every hiſtorian who treats of the times. Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus, give it their unanimous ſanction. The geographers acknowledge the places mentioned to exiſt, and Strabo's whole book is a commentary on the poet. The philoſophers and critics have never looked upon the ſtory as fabulous. Men of ſcience and judgment in all ages have paid the ſame homage to Homer's *veracity*; and Alexander, by ſacrificing at the tomb of Achilles, ſhewed in what light his tutor Ariſtotle had taught him to conſider the Iliad. The reader, who will examine the references I make to ancient Authors, will ſoon convince himſelf of their truth;

NOTE.

* For inſtance; The particulars of the murder of Pyrrhus by Oreſtes, that of Clytemneſtra, the ſufferings of Electra and Iphigenia, &c. all which are the frequent theme of the Greek tragedians.

truth; and his mind will probably ſuggeſt to him *many* more; but theſe are ſufficient to eſtabliſh my aſſertion. Therefore ſuppoſing the ſtory falſe, Homer adapted it not only to the plain, but to the names, characters, and collateral hiſtory of the times; and what is more extraordinary, to the traditions of Aſia, Egypt, and different parts of the world, which traditions were diſcovered by Herodotus; not to mention the prophetic ſpirit which he muſt have had to adapt himſelf to many collateral ſtories, brought into light by Authors who lived long after him. Nothing but acknowledging the truth can extricate us from this perplexed labyrinth of abſurdity; nothing more remains for me to prove. To thoſe who have never doubted the veracity of Homer, I may perhaps have afforded ſome ſatisfaction, by the teſtimony I have given in his favour from the actual ſtate of the Plain. From thoſe, who, without being aware of the whole merits of the cauſe, had placed an implicit confidence in the well-deſerved fame of Mr. Bryant, I have perhaps removed ſome prejudices. If either as a witneſs, or as an advocate I have been the means of throwing additional light on this celebrated part of Ancient Hiſtory; as this only has been my intention, the candid reader will make allowances for the manner in which I have executed it.

Authors who mention Troy as a real Place in Phrygia.

Heſiod Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι. l. i. ver. 163. et paſſim.
Pindar Olymp. ii. Stroph. v. et paſſim. Olymp. ix. Antiſtr. iii. Olymp. x. Ep. i. &c. &c.
Tryphiodorus Ιλιου αλωσις. This author was an Egyptian.
Callimachus εις λουτρα της Παλλαδος. ver. 18. et paſſim. The Librarian of Alexandria.
Æſchylus, Sophocles, Euripides, paſſim. See Agamemnon, Philoctetes, Troades, &c. &c. &c.
Lycophron. Αλεξανδρα paſſim. This Author wrote in Egypt.
Apollonius Rhodius. Librarian of Alexandria.
Syagrius, Phantaſia, Daphne, Dictys Cretenſis, Dares Phrygius, Helena, authors who lived before Homer, according to Mr. Bryant himſelf, and two of them Egyptians as he aſſerts.
Æſchines.

Demoſthenis

Demoſthenis επιταφιος λογος. p. 1392. l. ii. Oratores Græci. Edit. Reiſk.
Leſches, the author of the little Iliad, from which Sophocles took his Philoctetes, " quem ante Terpandrum vixiſſe ait Clemens Alexandrinus." p. 333. Tyrwhit. notes de re Poetica.
Proclus. Fragment, publiſhed by Mr. Tyrwhit. Note on Ariſtotle de re Poetic. Sec. 38. It is a Synopſis of a Poem, mentioned by Herodotus and Ariſtotle, τα κυπρια, and the ſubject is the Rape of Helen, &c. therefore Ariſtotle, the κυπρια and Proclus are all on myſide.
Theocritus Idyll. xxii. ver. 214. et paſſim.
Coluthus περι Ελενης αρπαγην.
Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus, Strabo, Pauſanias, Arrian, Ariſtotle, are quoted already in this work; the Arundel marbles and chronological writers are alſo cited.
Dionys. Halicarnaſſ. p. 27. ver. 9. p. 49. ver. 25. et paſſim.
Of Latin Authors. Livy derives Rome from Phrygia, which if wrong, ſtill argues his belief in the groundwork of the ſtory.
After him Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Valerius Flaccus, Petruvius, Q. Curtius, Statius, Lucretius, Lucan, &c. &c. &c. In ſhort on every ſide " C'eſt l'embarras des richeſſes," and the authorities I have given are as concluſive as if I multiplied quotations tenfold.

Writers who diſbelieved the Tale of Troy entirely.

Anaxagoras. This Philoſopher born in the 70th Olympiad, and quoted by Diogenes Laertius, as the *firſt* Sceptic on the ſubject.
Metrodorus apud. Diog. Laert. and Heſych. Tatian. Aſſyr. p. 262. his Contemporary.
A *Perſon* in Athenæus. Athen. l. xii. p. 510. of whom we know nothing.
Baſil Magnus προς τους νεους. An Author of the lower ages of the Roman Empire.
Mr. Bryant, A. D. 1796. The only author who places it in Egypt. His authority only " I imagine." Bryant, p. 62.

ERRATA.

Page 69. Notes. Line 5, for Helen, read Homer.
Page 71. Laſt line, for Σκεπφιος, read Σκεφιος.
Page 81. Line 5, for Ελλης πολνος, read Ελλης πονλος.
Page 85. Line 13, for οιτεμενος, read οι ἑμενος.
Page 90. Line 2, for αριστερα, read αριστερα.
Page 102. Laſt line but one, for ασυδε, read αξυδε.

FINIS



Mercah del.t

View of the Tombs of Achilles & Patroclus, and Promontory of Sigæum now Cape Janizari.



Merigot sculp.t

BSB Bayerische StaatsBibliothek

MDZ Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek

Morritt, John B. S.,

A Vindication of Homer and of the ancient Poets and Historians, who have recorded the Siege and Fall of Troy In Answer to two late Publications of Mr. Bryant ; With a Map and Plates

New York 1798

4 A.gr.a. 608
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10215200-9